arXiv:1405.6884v2 [stat.ME] 11 Jun 2014

Maximizing the expected range from dependent observations under mean-variance information[1]

Nickos Papadatos[2]

Department of Mathematics, Section of Statistics and O.R., University of Athens, Panepistemiopolis, 157 84 Athens, Greece.

Abstract: In this article we derive the best possible upper bound for $\mathbb{E}[\max_i\{X_i\} - \min_i\{X_i\}]$ under given means and variances on n random variables X_i. The random vector $(X_1,\ldots,X_n)$ is allowed to have any dependence structure, provided $\mathbb{E}X_i = \mu_i$ and $\mathrm{Var}X_i = \sigma_i^2$, $0 < \sigma_i < \infty$. We provide an explicit characterization of the n-variate distributions that attain the equality (extremal random vectors), and the tight bound is compared to other existing results.

MSC: 62G30, 60E15, 62E10.

Key words and phrases: Range; Dependent Observations; Tight Expectation Bounds; Extremal Random Vectors; Probability Matrices; Characterizations.

1 Introduction

The problem of determining best possible expectation bounds on linear functions of order statistics in terms of means and variances of the observations has a long history. Especially for the sample range based on $n \geqslant 2$ independent identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables, the problem goes back to Plackett (1947), Gumbel (1954) and Hartley and David (1954) who derived the inequality

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\max_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n}\{X_i\} - \min_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n}\{X_i\}\big] \leqslant n\sigma\sqrt{\tfrac{2}{2n-1}\Big(1 - \tfrac{1}{\binom{2n-2}{n-1}}\Big)}, \tag{1.1}$$

where σ^2 is the common variance of X_i. This bound is best possible in the sense that for any given values of $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma \in (0,\infty)$ there exist n i.i.d. random variables with mean μ and variance σ^2 that attain the equality in (1.1).

Since then, a lot of research has been developed in order to drop the assumptions of independence and/or identical distributions on the observations, and also to extend the results to any L-statistic of the form $L = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_{i:n}$, where c_i are given constants and $X_{1:n} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant X_{n:n}$ are the order statistics corresponding to the random vector $(X_1,\ldots,X_n)$. When the components X_i are merely assumed to be i.d. (identically distributed but not necessarily independent) with mean μ and variance σ^2, the best possible bounds for $\mathbb{E}L$ were established by Rychlik (1993b). In particular, setting $c_1 = -1$, $c_n = 1$ and $c_i = 0$ for any other i in Rychlik's result, we get the optimal upper bound for the expected range:

$$\mathbb{E}\,[X_{n:n} - X_{1:n}] \leqslant \sigma\sqrt{2n}. \tag{1.2}$$

For a comprehensive review of related results and extensions, the reader is referred to Rychlik's (2001) monograph; see also David (1981), Rychlik (1998) and David and Nagaraja

[1]Work partially supported by the University of Athens Research Grant 70/4/5637

[2]e-mail: npapadat@math.uoa.gr, url: users.uoa.gr/∼npapadat/

(2003). Dropping both assumptions of independence and i.d., Arnold and Groeneveld (1979) obtained the upper bound

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i X_{i:n}\right) \leqslant \overline{\mu}\sum_{i=1}^n c_i + \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (c_i-\overline{c})^2}\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n\{(\mu_i-\overline{\mu})^2+\sigma_i^2\}}, \tag{1.3}$$

which is valid for any random vector with $\mathbb{E}X_i=\mu_i$ and $\mathrm{Var}X_i=\sigma_i^2$, where $\overline{\mu}=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\mu_i$, $\overline{c}=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n c_i$. For other inequalities related to (1.3) the reader is referred to Nagaraja (1981), Aven (1985), Lefèvre (1986), Papadatos (2001a) and Kaluszka, Okolewski and Szymanska (2005); see also the monograph by Arnold and Balakrishnan (1989). Applied to the range, (1.3) yields the inequality

$$\mathbb{E}[X_{n:n}-X_{1:n}] \leqslant AG_n := \sqrt{2\sum_{i=1}^n\{(\mu_i-\overline{\mu})^2+\sigma_i^2\}}, \tag{1.4}$$

which, in the homogeneous case $\mu_i=\mu$, $\sigma_i^2=\sigma^2$, reduces to (1.2). However, the upper bound in (1.4) is not tight under general mean-variance information, and the purpose of the present work is to replace the RHS of (1.4) by its best possible value.

Recently, Bertsimas, Natarajan and Teo (2004, 2006) applied convex optimization techniques in order to replace the RHS of (1.3) by its tight counterpart in some particular cases of interest. They obtained, among other things, the best possible upper bound for the expected maximum under any mean-variance information and any dependence structure, namely,

$$\mathbb{E}X_{n:n} \leqslant BNT_n := -\tfrac{n-2}{2}y_0 + \tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\mu_i + \tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\sqrt{(\mu_i-y_0)^2+\sigma_i^2}, \tag{1.5}$$

where y_0 is the unique solution to the equation

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{y_0-\mu_i}{\sqrt{(\mu_i-y_0)^2+\sigma_i^2}} = n-2. \tag{1.6}$$

The equality in (1.5) is attained by the extremely dependent random vector with

$$\mathbb{P}[X_1=y_0-\alpha_1,\ldots,X_j=y_0+\alpha_j,\ldots,X_n=y_0-\alpha_n]=p_j,\quad j=1,\ldots,n,$$

where

$$\alpha_j=\sqrt{(\mu_j-y_0)^2+\sigma_j^2},\quad p_j=\tfrac{1}{2}\Big(1-\frac{y_0-\mu_j}{\sqrt{(\mu_j-y_0)^2+\sigma_j^2}}\Big),\quad j=1,\ldots,n.$$

Note that $p_j>0$ and, by (1.6), $\sum_{j=1}^n p_j=1$.

In the present work we extend the techniques of Lai and Robbins (1976) and of Bertsimas, Natarajan and Teo (2006), in order to obtain the best possible upper bound for the expected range. Also, we characterize the *extremal random vectors*, i.e. the vectors that attain the equality in the bound, and we provide simple conditions (on μ_i and σ_i) under which the AG_n bound of (1.4) is already sharp. The main result is given in Theorem 6.1. Particular cases of interest are presented as examples.

2 An upper bound for the expected range

Let $\boldsymbol{X} = (X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ be an arbitrary random vector with $\mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{X} = \boldsymbol{\mu} := (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n)$ and $(\mathrm{Var}X_1, \ldots, \mathrm{Var}X_n) = (\sigma_1^2, \ldots, \sigma_n^2)$ where $0 < \sigma_i < \infty$ for all i. For notational simplicity we write $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n)$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2 = (\sigma_1^2, \ldots, \sigma_n^2)$ and $\mathrm{Var}\boldsymbol{X} = \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2$; that is, $\mathrm{Var}\boldsymbol{X} := \mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is the dispersion matrix of $\boldsymbol{X}$. The class of random vectors satisfying the above moment requirements will be denoted by

$$\mathscr{F}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}) := \{\boldsymbol{X} : \mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{X} = \boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathrm{Var}\boldsymbol{X} = \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2\}. \tag{2.1}$$

In particular, $X \in \mathscr{F}_1(\mu, \sigma)$ means that $\mathbb{E}X = \mu$ and $\mathrm{Var}X = \sigma^2$.

Let $X_{1:n} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant X_{n:n}$ be the order statistics corresponding to $\boldsymbol{X}$ and set $R_n = X_{n:n} - X_{1:n}$ for the range. Our main interest is in calculating

$$\inf_{\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathscr{F}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})} \mathbb{E}R_n, \qquad \sup_{\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathscr{F}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})} \mathbb{E}R_n, \tag{2.2}$$

for any given $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$. However, the result is known for the infimum:

$$\inf_{\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathscr{F}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})} \mathbb{E}R_n = \max_i\{\mu_i\} - \min_i\{\mu_i\}.$$

Indeed, since $R_n = R_n(\boldsymbol{X})$ is a convex function of $\boldsymbol{X}$ we have $\mathbb{E}R_n(\boldsymbol{X}) \geqslant R_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \max_i\{\mu_i\} - \min_i\{\mu_i\}$ from Jensen's inequality. Bertsimas, Doan, Natarajan and Teo (2010) showed that this lower bound is best possible even for the narrowed class of random vectors with given mean vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and (any) given non-negative defined dispersion matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$. For clarity of the presentation we provide here the construction of Bertsimas, Doan, Natarajan and Teo (2010). Define

$$\boldsymbol{X}_\varepsilon = \boldsymbol{\mu} + \frac{I_\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \boldsymbol{V} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}, \quad 0 < \varepsilon < 1,$$

where $\boldsymbol{V} = (V_1, \ldots, V_n)$ with V_i being i.i.d. with zero mean and variance one and I_ε is a Bernoulli random variable, independent of $\boldsymbol{V}$, with probability of success equal to ε. Then it is easy to verify that for all $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, $\boldsymbol{X}_\varepsilon$ has mean $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and dispersion matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$. Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be the finite collection of vectors of the form $\boldsymbol{e}(i) - \boldsymbol{e}(j)$, $i \neq j$, $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, where $\boldsymbol{e}(i) = (0, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 0)$ is the unitary vector of the i-th axis. With $\boldsymbol{x}^{\mathrm{t}}$ denoting the transpose of any $1 \times n$ random vector $\boldsymbol{x}$ we have

$$R_n(\boldsymbol{X}_\varepsilon) = \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in A}\{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{X}_\varepsilon^{\mathrm{t}}\} \leqslant \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in A}\{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\mu}^{\mathrm{t}}\} + \tfrac{I_\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in A}\{\boldsymbol{\alpha}\, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{V}^{\mathrm{t}}\}.$$

Clearly, $\max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in A}\{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\mu}^{\mathrm{t}}\} = \max_i\{\mu_i\} - \min_i\{\mu_i\}$, while

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\tfrac{I_\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in A}\{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{V}^{\mathrm{t}}\}\Big) = \sqrt{\varepsilon}\, \mathbb{E}\Big(\max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in A}\{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{V}^{\mathrm{t}}\}\Big) \leqslant \sqrt{\varepsilon} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in A} \mathbb{E}\Big|\boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{V}^{\mathrm{t}}\Big| = \gamma\sqrt{\varepsilon},$$

where $\gamma \geqslant 0$ is a finite constant independent of ε. It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}R_n(\boldsymbol{X}_\varepsilon) \leqslant \max_i\{\mu_i\} - \min_i\{\mu_i\} + \gamma\sqrt{\varepsilon}$$

and thus,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \mathbb{E}R_n(\boldsymbol{X}_\varepsilon) = \max_i\{\mu_i\} - \min_i\{\mu_i\}.$$

Hence, the best possible lower bound for $\mathbb{E}R_n$ is $\max_i\{\mu_i\} - \min_i\{\mu_i\}$.

Regarding the supremum in (2.2), we shall make use of the following definition.

Definition 2.1. A random vector $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathscr{F}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ of dimension $n \geqslant 2$ will be called *extremal random vector* (for the range) if $\mathbb{E}R_n(\boldsymbol{X}) = \sup \mathbb{E}R_n$, where the supremum is taken over $\mathscr{F}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$. The class of extremal random vectors is denoted by $\mathscr{E}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$.

To the best of our knowledge, the value of the supremum and the nature of the set $\mathscr{E}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ have not been analysed elsewhere; it is not even known whether $\mathscr{E}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ in nonempty for general $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$. In the present article we shall address both issues.

We start with a deterministic inequality which is the range analogue of the inequality given by Lai and Robbins (1976):

Lemma 2.1. For any $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda > 0$,

$$R_n \leqslant -(n-2)\lambda + \tfrac{\lambda}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \left| \tfrac{X_i - c}{\lambda} - 1 \right| + \left| \tfrac{X_i - c}{\lambda} + 1 \right| \right\}. \tag{2.3}$$

The equality in (2.3) is attained if and only if

$$X_{1:n} \leqslant c - \lambda \leqslant X_{2:n} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant X_{n-1:n} \leqslant c + \lambda \leqslant X_{n:n}. \tag{2.4}$$

The Lemma entails that the use of two decision variables is sufficient for properly handling R_n. Also, it suggests the investigation of $\sup \mathbb{E}\{|X-1| + |X+1|\}$ when X is a random variable with given mean and variance:

Lemma 2.2. For any $X \in \mathscr{F}_1(\mu, \sigma)$ $(0 < \sigma < \infty)$,

$$\mathbb{E}\{|X-1| + |X+1|\} \leqslant U(\mu, \sigma), \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$U(\mu,\sigma) := \begin{cases} 2\sqrt{\mu^2+\sigma^2}, & \text{if} \quad \mu^2+\sigma^2 \geqslant 4, \\ 2 + \frac{1}{2}(\mu^2+\sigma^2), & \text{if} \quad 2|\mu| < \mu^2+\sigma^2 < 4, \\ |\mu| + 1 + \sqrt{(|\mu|-1)^2+\sigma^2}, & \text{if} \quad \mu^2+\sigma^2 \leqslant 2|\mu| < 4. \end{cases} \tag{2.6}$$

The equality in (2.5) is attained by a unique random variable $X^* \in \mathscr{F}_1(\mu, \sigma)$. Depending on (μ, σ), X^* assumes two or three supporting values. More precisely:
(a) For $\mu^2 + \sigma^2 \geqslant 4$,

$$\mathbb{P}\big[X^* = \sqrt{\mu^2+\sigma^2}\big] = \tfrac{1}{2}\Big(1 + \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{\mu^2+\sigma^2}}\Big) = 1 - \mathbb{P}\big[X^* = -\sqrt{\mu^2+\sigma^2}\big].$$

(b) For $2|\mu| < \mu^2 + \sigma^2 < 4$,

$$\mathbb{P}[X^* = 0] = 1 - \tfrac{\mu^2+\sigma^2}{4}, \quad \mathbb{P}[X^* = -2] = \tfrac{\mu^2+\sigma^2-2\mu}{8}, \quad \mathbb{P}[X^* = 2] = \tfrac{\mu^2+\sigma^2+2\mu}{8}.$$

(c) For $\mu^2+\sigma^2 \leqslant 2\mu$ (and hence, $0<\mu<2$),

$$\mathbb{P}\big[X^* = 1+\sqrt{(\mu-1)^2+\sigma^2}\big] = \tfrac{1}{2}\Big(1+\tfrac{\mu-1}{\sqrt{(\mu-1)^2+\sigma^2}}\Big) = 1-\mathbb{P}\big[X^* = 1-\sqrt{(\mu-1)^2+\sigma^2}\big].$$

(d) For $\mu^2+\sigma^2 \leqslant -2\mu$ (and hence, $-2<\mu<0$),

$$\mathbb{P}\big[X^* = -1+\sqrt{(\mu+1)^2+\sigma^2}\big] = \tfrac{1}{2}\Big(1+\tfrac{\mu+1}{\sqrt{(\mu+1)^2+\sigma^2}}\Big) = 1-\mathbb{P}\big[X^* = -1-\sqrt{(\mu+1)^2+\sigma^2}\big].$$

Remark 2.1. Isii (1963) presented general results that include inequalities of the form of Lemma 2.2; see also Karlin and Studden (1966). The univariate mean-variance inequality in Isii's paper can be stated as follows: If $h:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ is a Borel function, $\mu\in\mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma>0$ then

$$\sup_{X\in\mathscr{F}_1(\mu,\sigma)} \mathbb{E}h(X) = \inf_{\alpha_0,\alpha_1,\alpha_2} \big\{\alpha_0+\alpha_1\mu+\alpha_2(\mu^2+\sigma^2) : \alpha_0+\alpha_1 x+\alpha_2 x^2 \geqslant h(x) \text{ for all } x\big\}.$$

Isii showed that the above infimum is attained by some $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^* = (\alpha_0^*,\alpha_1^*,\alpha_2^*)\in A$, where

$$A = \{(\alpha_0,\alpha_1,\alpha_2) : \alpha_0+\alpha_1 x+\alpha_2 x^2 \geqslant h(x) \text{ for all } x\in\mathbb{R}\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3,$$

provided that the infimum is finite. However, usually it is not an easy task to specify the subset A and the extremal point(s) $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*$. Lemma 2.2 shows that this is possible for $h(x) = |x-1|+|x+1|$ and, more importantly, characterizes the case of equality.

The following corollary is a straightforward consequence of Lemma 2.2.

Corollary 2.1. Let $X\in\mathscr{F}_1(\mu,\sigma)$ $(0<\sigma<\infty)$. Fix $c\in\mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda>0$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E}\big\{|(X-c)-\lambda|+|(X-c)+\lambda|\big\} \leqslant \lambda\, U\big(\tfrac{\mu-c}{\lambda},\tfrac{\sigma}{\lambda}\big), \tag{2.7}$$

with $U(\cdot,\cdot)$ given by (2.6). The equality in (2.7) is attained by a unique two or three-valued random variable. Setting

$$\xi = \mu-c,\quad \theta = \sqrt{(\mu-c)^2+\sigma^2},\quad \alpha = \sqrt{(\xi-\lambda)^2+\sigma^2},\quad \beta = \sqrt{(\xi+\lambda)^2+\sigma^2},$$

the distribution that attains the equality is described by the following table:

No: Condition on μ, σ, c, λ Tight Upper Bound $\lambda\, U\big(\frac{\mu-c}{\lambda},\frac{\sigma}{\lambda}\big)$	value x^- probability p^-	value x^o probability p^o	value x^+ probability p^+
1: $(\mu-c)^2+\sigma^2 \geqslant 4\lambda^2$ $2\sqrt{(\mu-c)^2+\sigma^2}$	$c-\theta$ $\frac{1}{2}\big(1-\frac{\xi}{\theta}\big)$		$c+\theta$ $\frac{1}{2}\big(1+\frac{\xi}{\theta}\big)$
2: $2\lambda\lvert\mu-c\rvert < (\mu-c)^2+\sigma^2 < 4\lambda^2$ $2\lambda+\frac{1}{2\lambda}\big[(\mu-c)^2+\sigma^2\big]$	$c-2\lambda$ $\frac{1}{8\lambda^2}\big[\theta^2-2\lambda\xi\big]$	c $1-\frac{1}{4\lambda^2}\theta^2$	$c+2\lambda$ $\frac{1}{8\lambda^2}\big[\theta^2+2\lambda\xi\big]$
3: $(\mu-c)^2+\sigma^2 \leqslant 2\lambda(\mu-c)$ $\mu-c+\lambda+\sqrt{(\mu-c-\lambda)^2+\sigma^2}$		$c+\lambda-\alpha$ $\frac{1}{2}\big(1-\frac{\xi-\lambda}{\alpha}\big)$	$c+\lambda+\alpha$ $\frac{1}{2}\big(1+\frac{\xi-\lambda}{\alpha}\big)$
4: $(\mu-c)^2+\sigma^2 \leqslant 2\lambda(c-\mu)$ $c-\mu+\lambda+\sqrt{(c-\mu-\lambda)^2+\sigma^2}$	$c-\lambda-\beta$ $\frac{1}{2}\big(1-\frac{\xi+\lambda}{\beta}\big)$	$c-\lambda+\beta$ $\frac{1}{2}\big(1+\frac{\xi+\lambda}{\beta}\big)$	

Proof: Write $|(X-c)-\lambda|+|(X-c)+\lambda| = \lambda\Big\{\big|\frac{X-c}{\lambda}-1\big|+\big|\frac{X-c}{\lambda}+1\big|\Big\}$. Since $Y=\frac{X-c}{\lambda}\in \mathscr{F}_1\big(\frac{\mu-c}{\lambda},\frac{\sigma}{\lambda}\big)$, Lemma 2.2 yields (2.7) as follows:

$$\mathbb{E}\big\{|(X-c)-\lambda|+|(X-c)+\lambda|\big\} = \lambda\,\mathbb{E}\big\{|Y-1|+|Y+1|\big\} \leqslant \lambda\, U\big(\tfrac{\mu-c}{\lambda},\tfrac{\sigma}{\lambda}\big).$$

Since $\lambda>0$, Lemma 2.2 asserts that the equality is attained by a unique random variable $Y^*\in\mathscr{F}_1\big(\frac{\mu-c}{\lambda},\frac{\sigma}{\lambda}\big)$. Thus, $X^*=c+\lambda Y^*$ is the unique random variable in $\mathscr{F}_1(\mu,\sigma)$ that attains the equality in (2.7). Substituting the probability function of Y^* in the four distinct cases of Lemma 2.2 we obtain the probabilities and supporting points as in the table. □

It is important to observe that, whatever the values of μ,σ,c,λ are, the supporting points satisfy the relation $x^-<c-\lambda<x^o<c+\lambda<x^+$.

We can now obtain the proposed upper bound for the expected range.

Theorem 2.1. If $\mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{X}=\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\mathrm{Var}\boldsymbol{X}=\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2$ then

$$\mathbb{E}R_n \leqslant \inf_{c\in\mathbb{R},\lambda>0}\Big\{-(n-2)\lambda+\frac{\lambda}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n U\Big(\frac{\mu_i-c}{\lambda},\frac{\sigma_i}{\lambda}\Big)\Big\}, \tag{2.8}$$

where the function $U(\cdot,\cdot):\mathbb{R}\times(0,\infty)\to(2,\infty)$ is given by (2.6).

Proof: Fix $c\in\mathbb{R}$, $\lambda>0$. We take expectations in (2.3) and then use (2.7) to get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}R_n &\leqslant -(n-2)\lambda+\tfrac{1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\big\{|(X_i-c)-\lambda|+|(X_i-c)+\lambda|\big\}\\ &\leqslant -(n-2)\lambda+\tfrac{\lambda}{2}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n U\big(\frac{\mu_i-c}{\lambda},\frac{\sigma_i}{\lambda}\big).\end{aligned}$$

Since for all $c\in\mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda>0$ the last quantity is an upper bound for $\mathbb{E}R_n$, its infimum is an upper bound too. □

Remark 2.2. It is not clear at this stage whether the upper bound (2.8) is tight, and it is not an obvious task to find $c=c_0$ and $\lambda=\lambda_0$ (if exist) that realize the infimum in the RHS of (2.8). However, the substitution of any (convenient) arguments c and λ in the function

$$\phi_n(c,\lambda) := -(n-2)\lambda+\tfrac{\lambda}{2}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n U\big(\frac{\mu_i-c}{\lambda},\frac{\sigma_i}{\lambda}\big) \tag{2.9}$$

will produce an upper bound for $\mathbb{E}R_n$. For example, one can choose $c=\overline{\mu}$ and $\lambda=\frac{1}{4}AG_n$ (see (1.4)). A simple way to produce a closed-form upper bound is the following: First observe that

$$\lambda\, U\Big(\tfrac{\mu_i-c}{\lambda},\tfrac{\sigma_i}{\lambda}\Big) \leqslant 2\lambda+\tfrac{1}{2\lambda}\big[(\mu_i-c)^2+\sigma_i^2\big],$$

because the RHS is an upper bound for the expectation $\mathbb{E}\big\{|(X_i-c)-\lambda|+|(X_i-c)+\lambda|\big\}$ (since $|(X_i-c)-\lambda|+|(X_i-c)+\lambda|\leqslant 2\lambda+\frac{1}{2\lambda}(X_i-c)^2$ and $\mathbb{E}\big\{2\lambda+\frac{1}{2\lambda}(X_i-c)^2\big\}=2\lambda+\frac{1}{2\lambda}[(\mu_i-c)^2+\sigma_i^2]$), while the LHS is the least upper bound for the same expectation as X_i varies in $\mathscr{F}_1(\mu_i,\sigma_i)$. It follows that

$$\phi_n(c,\lambda)\leqslant\overline{\phi}_n(c,\lambda) := 2\lambda+\tfrac{1}{4\lambda}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\big\{(\mu_i-c)^2+\sigma_i^2\big\}.$$

Minimizing $\overline{\phi}_n(c,\lambda)$ is a simple fact: it suffices to take $c=\overline{\mu}$ and $\lambda=\frac{1}{4}AG_n$ as before. Observing that $\sum_{i=i}^n\left\{(\mu_i-\overline{\mu})^2+\sigma_i^2\right\}=\frac{1}{2}AG_n^2$ we get

$$\mathbb{E}R_n\leqslant\inf_{c\in\mathbb{R},\lambda>0}\phi_n(c,\lambda)\leqslant\inf_{c\in\mathbb{R},\lambda>0}\overline{\phi}_n(c,\lambda)=\overline{\phi}_n\Big(\overline{\mu},\frac{1}{4}AG_n\Big)=\frac{1}{2}AG_n+\frac{1}{2}AG_n=AG_n.$$

Now it became clear that the bound in (2.8) is reasonable, since it outperforms the bound in (1.4) for any given values of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$. As a result, the AG_n bound need no be tight; e.g., the infimum of $\phi_n(c,\lambda)$ need no be attained at $(c,\lambda)=\big(\overline{\mu},\frac{1}{4}AG_n\big)$. We shall prove in the sequel that the new bound is always tight, and (for $n\geqslant 3$) the infimum in the RHS of (2.8) is attained by a unique value (c_0,λ_0).

Remark 2.3. Fixing μ in (2.6) and taking limits for $\sigma\searrow 0$ we see that

$$\lim_{\sigma\searrow 0}U(\mu,\sigma)=2\max\{|\mu|,1\}=|\mu-1|+|\mu+1|,\ \ \mu\in\mathbb{R}.$$

Let us now set $\sigma_{n:n}=\max\{\sigma_1,\ldots,\sigma_n\}$ and fix $\boldsymbol{\mu}=(\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_n)$. Then,

$$\lim_{\sigma_{n:n}\searrow 0}\phi_n(c,\lambda)=-(n-2)\lambda+\frac{\lambda}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\left\{\left|\frac{\mu_i-c}{\lambda}-1\right|+\left|\frac{\mu_i-c}{\lambda}+1\right|\right\},\ \ \boldsymbol{\mu}\in\mathbb{R}^n,\ c\in\mathbb{R},\ \lambda>0.$$

Let $\mu_{1:n}\leqslant\cdots\leqslant\mu_{n:n}$ be the ordered values of $\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_n$, and assume that the μ's are not all equal, that is, $\mu_{1:n}<\mu_{n:n}$. Substituting in the above limit $c=c_0=\frac{\mu_{1:n}+\mu_{n:n}}{2}$, $\lambda=\lambda_0=\frac{\mu_{n:n}-\mu_{1:n}}{2}>0$, we obtain

$$\lim_{\sigma_{n:n}\searrow 0}\phi_n(c_0,\lambda_0)=-(n-2)\lambda_0+\frac{\lambda_0}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\left\{\left|\frac{\mu_i-c_0}{\lambda_0}-1\right|+\left|\frac{\mu_i-c_0}{\lambda_0}+1\right|\right\}=\mu_{n:n}-\mu_{1:n}.$$

Note that the last equality follows from (2.3) and (2.4), applied to $\boldsymbol{X}=\boldsymbol{\mu}$ (with $R_n(\boldsymbol{\mu})=\mu_{n:n}-\mu_{1:n}$), observing that for the particular choice of (c_0,λ_0),

$$\mu_{1:n}\leqslant c_0-\lambda_0\leqslant\mu_{2:n}\leqslant\cdots\leqslant\mu_{n-1:n}\leqslant c_0+\lambda_0\leqslant\mu_{n:n}.$$

For any $\boldsymbol{X}\in\mathscr{F}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ it is true that $\mu_{n:n}-\mu_{1:n}\leqslant\mathbb{E}R_n(\boldsymbol{X})\leqslant\inf_{c\in\mathbb{R},\lambda>0}\left\{\phi_n(c,\lambda)\right\}$. Therefore,

$$\mu_{n:n}-\mu_{1:n}\leqslant\lim_{\sigma_{n:n}\searrow 0}\mathbb{E}R_n(\boldsymbol{X})\leqslant\lim_{\sigma_{n:n}\searrow 0}\left\{\inf_{c\in\mathbb{R},\lambda>0}\phi_n(c,\lambda)\right\}\leqslant\lim_{\sigma_{n:n}\searrow 0}\phi_n(c_0,\lambda_0)=\mu_{n:n}-\mu_{1:n},$$

and we conclude that

$$\lim_{\sigma_{n:n}\searrow 0}\left\{\inf_{c\in\mathbb{R},\lambda>0}\phi_n(c,\lambda)\right\}=\mu_{n:n}-\mu_{1:n}.\tag{2.10}$$

The limit (2.10) continue to hold even if all μ_i's are equal. Then $\mu_{1:n}=\mu_{n:n}$ and the inequality $\inf_{c\in\mathbb{R},\lambda>0}\left\{\phi_n(c,\lambda)\right\}\leqslant AG_n$ (see Remark 2.2) shows that

$$0\leqslant\inf_{c\in\mathbb{R},\lambda>0}\left\{\phi_n(c,\lambda)\right\}\leqslant AG_n=\sqrt{2\sum_{i=1}^n\sigma_i^2}\leqslant\sigma_{n:n}\sqrt{2n}\to 0,\quad\text{as }\sigma_{n:n}\searrow 0.$$

From these considerations it is again clear that the AG_n bound is not tight in general; for example,

$$\lim_{\sigma_{n:n}\searrow 0}AG_n=\sqrt{2\sum_{i=1}^n(\mu_i-\overline{\mu})^2}>\mu_{n:n}-\mu_{1:n}$$

whenever ($n\geqslant 3$ and) $\mu_{1:n}+\mu_{n:n}\neq 2\overline{\mu}$. The AG_n bound need no be tight even for equal μ_i's; see Theorem 3.1 and Example 3.2, below.

3 When is the Arnold-Groeneveld bound tight?

Arnold and Groeneveld (1979), Rychlik (1993b) and Papadatos (2001a) showed that if $\mu_i = \mu$ and $\sigma_i = \sigma$ for all i, the AG_n bound of (1.4), which reduces to (1.2), is attainable. In the present section we provide an exact characterization of the attainability of the AG_n bound under any mean-variance information.

The proof of Theorem 3.1, below, is based on the construction of particular bivariate probability distributions supported in a subset of $\{1,\ldots,n\}^2$. A distribution of this kind corresponds to a $n \times n$ matrix with nonnegative elements having sum 1; a probability matrix. Matrices of this form with integer-valued entries have been extensively studied; for a recent review see Barvinok (2012). The actual question, related to our problem, is whether there exist probability matrices with given marginals and vanishing trace.

The following notation and terminology will be used in the sequel.

Definition 3.1. A $n \times m$ matrix $Q = (q_{ij})$ ($n \geqslant 1$, $m \geqslant 1$) is called *a probability matrix* if it has nonnegative elements summing to 1. In particular, a n-variate *probability vector* $\boldsymbol{p} = (p_1,\ldots,p_n)$ is a probability matrix with dimension $1 \times n$, and $X \sim \boldsymbol{p}$ is a convention for $\mathbb{P}[X = i] = p_i$ for all i. The *marginals* of Q, say $\boldsymbol{p}$, $\boldsymbol{q}$, are the probability vectors obtained by summing the rows and columns of Q, respectively; and $\mathscr{M}(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q})$ denotes the class of probability matrices with given marginals $\boldsymbol{p}$, $\boldsymbol{q}$. Moreover, $(X,Y) \sim Q$ is a convention for $\mathbb{P}[X = i, Y = j] = q_{ij}$ for all i, j.

We now state a characterization for the AG_n bound.

Theorem 3.1. Assume that $\mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{X} = \boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\mathrm{Var}\boldsymbol{X} = \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2$. Then the equality in (1.4) is attainable if and only if both conditions (i) and (ii) below are satisfied.

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{(i)} \qquad |\mu_i - \overline{\mu}| \leqslant \frac{\sqrt{2}\left[(\mu_i-\overline{\mu})^2+\sigma_i^2\right]}{\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n\left\{(\mu_j-\overline{\mu})^2+\sigma_j^2\right\}}}, \\ &\text{(ii)} \qquad \frac{(\mu_i-\overline{\mu})^2+\sigma_i^2}{\sum_{j=1}^n\left\{(\mu_j-\overline{\mu})^2+\sigma_j^2\right\}} \leqslant \frac{1}{2}, \end{aligned} \qquad i = 1,\ldots,n. \tag{3.1}$$

Provided that (i) and (ii) are fulfilled, any extremal random vector $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathscr{E}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ has the representation

$$\boldsymbol{X} = g(X,Y) := \overline{\mu}\,\mathbf{1} + \frac{\boldsymbol{e}(X)-\boldsymbol{e}(Y)}{\sqrt{2}}\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n\left\{(\mu_j-\overline{\mu})^2+\sigma_j^2\right\}}, \tag{3.2}$$

where $\mathbf{1} = (1,\ldots,1) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\boldsymbol{e}(i) = (0,\ldots,1,\ldots,0)$, and (X,Y) is a discrete random pair satisfying $\mathbb{P}[X = Y] = 0$, with marginal distributions

$$\begin{aligned} p_i^+ = \mathbb{P}[X = i] &= \frac{(\mu_i-\overline{\mu})^2+\sigma_i^2+\frac{1}{2}(\mu_i-\overline{\mu})AG_n}{\sum_{j=1}^n\left\{(\mu_j-\overline{\mu})^2+\sigma_j^2\right\}}, \\ p_i^- = \mathbb{P}[Y = i] &= \frac{(\mu_i-\overline{\mu})^2+\sigma_i^2-\frac{1}{2}(\mu_i-\overline{\mu})AG_n}{\sum_{j=1}^n\left\{(\mu_j-\overline{\mu})^2+\sigma_j^2\right\}}, \end{aligned} \qquad i = 1,\ldots,n. \tag{3.3}$$

Moreover, if the inequalities in (3.1) are strict for all i, we can find infinitely many extremal random vectors; and if (3.1) is satisfied and for some i we have equality in (ii), then the extremal random vector is unique.

Remark 3.1. Let $(\mu_1,\mu_2,\mu_3)=(-1,0,1)$, $(\sigma_1^2,\sigma_2^2,\sigma_3^2)=(1,3,2)$, so that (3.1) holds. However, (3.1)(ii) is satisfied with strict inequalities for all i, while this is not true for (3.1)(i). We find $AG_3=4$ and $\boldsymbol{p}^+=\left(0,\frac{3}{8},\frac{5}{8}\right)$, $\boldsymbol{p}^-=\left(\frac{1}{2},\frac{3}{8},\frac{1}{8}\right)$. It is easily seen that the distribution of (X_1,X_2,X_3) (given in (3.2)) is uniquely defined: it assigns probabilities $\frac{2}{8},\frac{2}{8},\frac{3}{8},\frac{1}{8}$, to the points $(-2,2,0)$, $(-2,0,2)$, $(0,-2,2)$, $(0,2,-2)$, respectively. It follows that a random vector that attains the AG_n bound can be unique even if (3.1)(ii) is satisfied with strict inequalities for all i.

Example 3.1. *The homogeneous case* $\mu_i=\mu$, $\sigma_i=\sigma>0$. Conditions (3.1) are obviously satisfied with strict inequalities (for $n\geqslant 3$) and the AG_n bound is sharp (see also (1.2)):

$$\sup \mathbb{E}R_n = AG_n = \sigma\sqrt{2n}.$$

Moreover, $p_i^+=p_i^-=\frac{1}{n}$ and from Theorem 3.1 we see that infinitely many random vectors attain the equality. The totality of them is characterized by (3.2) via the probability matrices Q of (X,Y). Recall that X and Y are, respectively, the positions where $\mu+\sigma\sqrt{n/2}$ and $\mu-\sigma\sqrt{n/2}$ appears in the extremal vector $(X_1,\dots,X_n)$; the rest entries are equal to μ. Thus, Q has uniform marginals and vanishing principal diagonal. A famous theorem of Birkhoff on *magic matrices* asserts that any matrix with nonnegative elements having row/column sums equal to 1 is a convex combination of *permutation matrices*, i.e., matrices with entries 0 or 1, having exactly one 1 in each row and in each column; see Theorem 2.54 in Giaquinta and Modica (2012). From Birkhoff's result it is evident that the probability matrix Q of (X,Y), corresponding to any extremal random vector $\boldsymbol{X}=\mu\mathbf{1}+\sigma[\boldsymbol{e}(X)-\boldsymbol{e}(Y)]\sqrt{n/2}$, can be written as

$$Q=\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i D_i,\quad \lambda_i\geqslant 0,\quad \sum_{i=1}^k\lambda_i=\frac{1}{n},$$

where the D_i's are *derangement matrices*, i.e. permutation matrices with vanishing diagonal entries. It is well-known that there exist $n!\sum_{k=0}^n\frac{(-1)^k}{k!}\approx e^{-1}n!$ different derangement matrices; they coincide with the extremal points of the convex polytope $\left\{D=(d_{ij}):\sum_i d_{ij}=\sum_j d_{ij}=1,\ d_{ij}\geqslant 0,\ d_{ii}=0 \text{ for all } i,j\right\}$. In general, a convex polytope has a finite (often quite large) number of extremal points, but it is rather difficult to evaluate them exactly, since their total number depends on the marginals in an ambiguous way (cf. Example 3.2, below).

Example 3.2. *The case* $\mu_i=\mu$. Assume $0<\sigma_1\leqslant\cdots\leqslant\sigma_n$ without loss of generality. From Theorem 3.1 we see that if the larger variance does not dominate the sum of the other variances then the AG_n bound is tight:

$$\sup\mathbb{E}R_n=AG_n=\sqrt{2\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\sigma_i^2},\quad \text{whenever}\quad \sigma_n^2\leqslant\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\sigma_i^2.$$

Moreover, if $\sigma_n^2=\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\sigma_i^2$, the equality is uniquely attained by the random vector $\boldsymbol{X}$ taking values

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{x}_i&=\left(\mu,\dots,\mu,\mu+\tfrac{AG_n}{2},\mu,\dots,\mu;\mu-\tfrac{AG_n}{2}\right),\quad \text{with probability } p_i,\\ \boldsymbol{y}_i&=\left(\mu,\dots,\mu,\mu-\tfrac{AG_n}{2},\mu,\dots,\mu;\mu+\tfrac{AG_n}{2}\right),\quad \text{with probability } p_i,\end{aligned}$$

where $p_i = \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\sum_{j=1}^n \sigma_j^2}$, $i = 1,\dots,n-1$. Of course, if $\sigma_n^2 < \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sigma_i^2$ then there exist infinitely many extremal random vectors. They have the form $g(X,Y)$ (see (3.2)), with $\mathbb{P}[X=Y]=0$, $X \sim \boldsymbol{p}$, $Y \sim \boldsymbol{p}$, where $\boldsymbol{p} = (p_1,\dots,p_{n-1},p_n)$.

However, if $\sigma_n^2 > \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sigma_i^2$ then the AG_n is no longer tight: The infimum in (2.8) is attained at $c_0 = \mu$, $\lambda_0 = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sigma_i^2} < \frac{1}{4} AG_n$, and we get the inequality

$$\mathbb{E}R_n \leqslant \phi_n(c_0,\lambda_0) = \sigma_n + \sqrt{\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sigma_i^2} \qquad \big(\sigma_n^2 > \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sigma_i^2\big).$$

From $\sqrt{x}+\sqrt{y} < \sqrt{2(x+y)}$ for $x \neq y$ we conclude that this bound is strictly better than AG_n. Moreover, the new bound is tight; one can verify that the equality is (uniquely) attained by the random vector $\boldsymbol{X}$ taking values

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{x}_i &= \big(\mu,\dots,\mu,\mu+\sqrt{\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sigma_i^2},\mu,\dots,\mu;\mu-\sigma_n\big), \quad \text{with probability } p_i, \\ \boldsymbol{y}_i &= \big(\mu,\dots,\mu,\mu-\sqrt{\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sigma_i^2},\mu,\dots,\mu;\mu+\sigma_n\big), \quad \text{with probability } p_i, \end{aligned}$$

where $p_i = \frac{\sigma_i^2}{2\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \sigma_j^2}$, $i = 1,\dots,n-1$. Thus, the tight upper bound on the expected range from dependent observations with equal means admits a simple closed form:

$$\sup \mathbb{E}R_n = \begin{cases} \sqrt{2\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2}, & \text{if} \quad 2\max_i\{\sigma_i^2\} \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2, \\ \max_i\{\sigma_i\} + \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2 - \max_i\{\sigma_i^2\}}, & \text{if} \quad 2\max_i\{\sigma_i^2\} \geqslant \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2. \end{cases} \tag{3.4}$$

Assuming that one variance tends to infinity (and keeping all other variances bounded), the limit $\lim_{\sigma_i \to \infty} \frac{\sup \mathbb{E}R_n}{AG_n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \approx .707$ says that we can gain of an up to 30% improvement over the AG_n bound.

The following lemma will play an important role in verifying existence of extremal random vectors.

Lemma 3.1. Let $\boldsymbol{p} = (p_1,\dots,p_n)$ and $\boldsymbol{q} = (q_1,\dots,q_n)$ be two probability vectors. A necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a random pair (X,Y) with

$$\mathbb{P}[X=Y]=0,\ X \sim \boldsymbol{p},\ Y \sim \boldsymbol{q} \tag{3.5}$$

is the following:

$$\max_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n} \big\{p_i + q_i\big\} \leqslant 1. \tag{3.6}$$

If the equality holds in (3.6), the random pair (X,Y) is uniquely defined. If strict inequality holds in (3.6) and, furthermore, $\min_i\{p_i\} > 0$, $\min_i\{q_i\} > 0$, then there exist infinitely many random pairs satisfying (3.5).

4 Convexity

The purpose of the present section is to verify that for any given values of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$, the function $\phi_n(c,\lambda)$ of (2.9) is convex. For convenience we set $T := \mathbb{R}\times(0,\infty)$ for the domain of both functions U (of (2.6)) and ϕ_n.

We begin with a simple lemma.

Lemma 4.1. The function $U(x,y) : T \to (2,\infty)$ of (2.6) has continuous partial derivatives, that is, $U \in C^1(T)$.

We also need another simple lemma; see, e.g., Giaquinta and Modica (2012).

Lemma 4.2. Let K be a convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $f : K \to \mathbb{R}$. For $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{y}$ in K consider the function $g : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$g(t) := f\big(\boldsymbol{x}+t(\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{x})\big),\ \ 0 \leqslant t \leqslant 1.$$

Then, f is convex if and only if g is convex for any choice of $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{y}$ in K.

Also, we shall make use of the following lemma.

Lemma 4.3. Consider a finite interval $[\alpha,\beta]$, a partition

$$\alpha = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_k < t_{k+1} = \beta$$

and the convex functions $g_i : [\alpha,\beta] \to \mathbb{R}$ $(i = 1,\ldots,k+1)$. Assume that

$$g_i(t_i) = g_{i+1}(t_i) \ \text{ and } \ g_i'(t_i-) \leqslant g_{i+1}'(t_i+),\ \ i = 1,\ldots,k, \tag{4.1}$$

where $g'(t-)$ and $g'(t+)$ denote, respectively, the left and right hand side derivatives of g at t. Then, the function

$$g(t) := \begin{cases} g_1(t), & \alpha \leqslant t \leqslant t_1, \\ g_2(t), & t_1 \leqslant t \leqslant t_2, \\ \ \ \vdots & \\ g_k(t), & t_{k-1} \leqslant t \leqslant t_k, \\ g_{k+1}(t), & t_k \leqslant t \leqslant \beta, \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

is convex.

Proof: Since all g_i have non-decreasing left and right hand side derivatives, it is easily seen that the same is true for g. □

Now we can verify the following result.

Proposition 4.1. The function $U : T \to (2,\infty)$ in (2.6) is convex.

Finally, we shall make use of the following property, which seems to be of some independent interest.

Lemma 4.4. Let $f(x,y) : T \to \mathbb{R}$ and for fixed $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $y_0 > 0$, consider the function $h(c,\lambda) : T \to \mathbb{R}$ with

$$h(c,\lambda) := \lambda\, f\big(\tfrac{x_0-c}{\lambda}, \tfrac{y_0}{\lambda}\big), \quad (c,\lambda) \in \mathbb{R} \times (0,\infty).$$

(i) If f is convex then h is convex for all choices of $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $y_0 > 0$.
(ii) If h is convex for a particular choice of $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $y_0 > 0$, then f is convex.

We can now state and prove the final conclusion of the present section:

Theorem 4.1. For any given $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$, the function $\phi_n(c,\lambda)$ in (2.9) is convex and belongs to $C^1(T)$, $T = \mathbb{R} \times (0,\infty)$.

Proof: The fact that $\phi_n \in C^1(T)$ follows by an obvious application of Lemma 4.1. Also, the function $U(x,y)$ in (2.6) is convex by Proposition 4.1. Hence, by Lemma 4.4, the same is true for the function $h_i(c,\lambda) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda\, U\big(\frac{\mu_i-c}{\lambda}, \frac{\sigma_i}{\lambda}\big)$ $(i = 1,\ldots,n)$. Since $h(c,\lambda) = -(n-2)\lambda$ is trivially convex, $\phi_n(c,\lambda)$ is a sum of convex functions. $\square$

5 Attainability of the infimum in (2.8) at a unique point

From now on we assume that $n \geqslant 3$. The simple (but interesting) case $n = 2$ is deferred to the last section, noting that the optimal upper bound for $\mathbb{E}R_2$ is closely related to the bound BNT_2 of (1.5).

In the present section we shall prove that the minimum value of $\phi_n(c,\lambda)$ is achieved at a unique point $(c_0,\lambda_0) \in T$. Of course, since ϕ_n is differentiable, a minimizing point (if exists) has to satisfy the system of equations

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial c}\phi_n(c,\lambda) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda}\phi_n(c,\lambda) = 0. \tag{5.1}$$

However, due to the complicated form of the derivatives (see (A.2), (A.3)), it is not a trivial fact to solve (5.1), or even to verify its consistency analytically. On the other hand, as we shall see in the sequel, it is important to know the existence (and uniqueness) of a minimizing point; it will be used in an essential way in the construction of extremal random vectors, concluding tightness of the bound (2.8).

The attainability of the infimum can be seen as follows:
Set $\varepsilon_0 := \frac{1}{4}\min_i\{\sigma_i\} > 0$. For $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda \in (0,\varepsilon_0]$, $(\mu_i - c)^2 + \sigma_i^2 \geqslant 4\lambda^2$ $(i = 1,\ldots,n)$. Thus, $\lambda\, U(\frac{\mu_i-c}{\lambda}, \frac{\sigma_i}{\lambda}) = 2\sqrt{(\mu_i-c)^2+\sigma_i^2}$ for all i, and

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_n(c,\lambda) &= -(n-2)\lambda + \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{(\mu_i-c)^2+\sigma_i^2} \\ &\geqslant -(n-2)\varepsilon_0 + \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{(\mu_i-c)^2+\sigma_i^2} = \phi_n(c,\varepsilon_0).\end{aligned}$$

The function $c \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{(\mu_i-c)^2+\sigma_i^2}$ is strictly convex, tending to ∞ as $|c| \to \infty$; thus, its minimum is attained at a unique $c = c_1$. From $\phi_n(c,\varepsilon_0) \geqslant \phi_n(c_1,\varepsilon_0)$ we get

$$\phi_n(c,\lambda) \geqslant \phi_n(c_1,\varepsilon_0) = -(n-2)\varepsilon_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{(\mu_i-c_1)^2+\sigma_i^2}, \;\; c \in \mathbb{R},\; 0 < \lambda \leqslant \varepsilon_0.$$

We now chose $\lambda_1 := \frac{1}{2}\min_i\{\sigma_i\}$, so that $\lambda_1 > \varepsilon_0$ and $(\mu_i - c_1)^2 + \sigma_i^2 \geqslant 4\lambda_1^2$ for all i. Therefore, $\lambda_1 U(\frac{\mu_i - c_1}{\lambda_1}, \frac{\sigma_i}{\lambda_1}) = 2\sqrt{(\mu_i - c_1)^2 + \sigma_i^2}$ $(i = 1, \ldots, n)$, and it follows that $\phi_n(c_1, \lambda_1) = -(n-2)\lambda_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{(\mu_i - c_1)^2 + \sigma_i^2}$. Since $\lambda_1 > \varepsilon_0$ and $n \geqslant 3$, the inequality $-(n-2)\varepsilon_0 > -(n-2)\lambda_1$ leads to $\phi_n(c_1, \varepsilon_0) > \phi_n(c_1, \lambda_1)$. Moreover, $U(x,y) \geqslant U(0,y) = 2 + \int_0^y \min\{t, 2\}dt > 2$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $y > 0$. We thus obtain $\phi_n(c, \lambda) = -(n-2)\lambda + \frac{\lambda}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n U(\frac{\mu_i - c}{\lambda}, \frac{\sigma_i}{\lambda}) > -(n-2)\lambda + n\lambda = 2\lambda$ for all c and $\lambda > 0$. Setting $M_0 := \frac{1}{2}\phi_n(c_1, \varepsilon_0) > \varepsilon_0$ we see that

$$\phi_n(c, \lambda) \geqslant \phi_n(c_1, \varepsilon_0) > \phi_n(c_1, \lambda_1) \ \text{ for all } c \in \mathbb{R},\ \lambda \in (0, \varepsilon_0] \cup [M_0, \infty).$$

Assume now that $\lambda \in (\varepsilon_0, M_0)$ with ε_0, M_0 as above. From the obvious inequality $U(x,y) \geqslant 2\max\{|x|, 1\} \geqslant 2|x|$ we get

$$\phi_n(c, \lambda) \geqslant -(n-2)\lambda + \sum_{i=1}^n |\mu_i - c| \geqslant -(n-2)M_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n |\mu_i - c|.$$

The last inequality shows that $\phi_n(c, \lambda) \to \infty$ as $|c| \to \infty$, uniformly in $\lambda \in (\varepsilon_0, M_0)$; thus, we can find a constant C_0 such that

$$\phi_n(c, \lambda) \geqslant \phi_n(c_1, \varepsilon_0) \ \text{ for all } |c| \geqslant C_0,\ \lambda \in (\varepsilon_0, M_0).$$

Since $\phi_n(c_1, \varepsilon_0) > \phi_n(c_1, \lambda_1)$, we arrived at the conclusion

$$\phi_n(c, \lambda) > \phi_n(c_1, \lambda_1) \ \text{ for all } (c, \lambda) \text{ with } |c| \geqslant C_0 \text{ or } \lambda \leqslant \varepsilon_0 \text{ or } \lambda \geqslant M_0.$$

This inequality shows that any minimizing point (c_0, λ_0) of (the continuous function) $\phi_n(c, \lambda)$ over the compact rectangle $R := [-C_0, C_0] \times [\varepsilon_0, M_0]$ must lie in the interior of R. The convexity of ϕ_n implies that its global minimum is attained at (c_0, λ_0). On the other hand, the differentiability of ϕ_n shows that $(c, \lambda) = (c_0, \lambda_0)$ is a solution to (5.1); and the convexity of ϕ_n implies that any such solution is a minimizing point.

Let us now define

$$T_0 := \big\{(c, \lambda) \in T : (c, \lambda) \text{ is a solution to (5.1)}\big\}, \tag{5.2}$$

so that $T_0 \neq \emptyset$. The minimizing points of the convex function ϕ_n are exactly the points of T_0; thus, T_0 is a convex compact subset of T, and we have shown the following

Proposition 5.1. If $n \geqslant 3$ then for any given values of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$, the system (5.1) is consistent, and the set of solutions, T_0, is a convex compact subset of T. Moreover, for any $(c_0, \lambda_0) \in T_0$,

$$\phi_n(c, \lambda) \geqslant \phi_n(c_0, \lambda_0) \quad \text{for all } (c, \lambda) \in T = \mathbb{R} \times (0, \infty),$$

with equality if and only if $(c, \lambda) \in T_0$.

We now proceed to show that T_0 is a singleton. Let as fix $c = c_1 \in \mathbb{R}$. For this particular value c_1 we consider the function

$$\psi_n(\lambda) := \phi_n(c_1, \lambda) = -(n-2)\lambda + \sum_{i=1}^n u_i(\lambda), \ \ \lambda > 0,$$

where

$$u_i(\lambda) := \tfrac{1}{2}\lambda\, U(\tfrac{\mu_i - c_1}{\lambda}, \tfrac{\sigma_i}{\lambda}),\ \ \lambda > 0\ \ (i = 1, \ldots, n).$$

The function u_i can be written more precisely as follows:

$$u_i(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{(\mu_i - c_1)^2 + \sigma_i^2}, & 0 < \lambda \leqslant t_i, \\ \lambda + \frac{1}{4\lambda}\big[(\mu_i - c_1)^2 + \sigma_i^2\big], & t_i \leqslant \lambda < \gamma_i, \\ \frac{1}{2}\Big\{|\mu_i - c_1| + \lambda + \sqrt{(|\mu_i - c_1| - \lambda)^2 + \sigma_i^2}\Big\}, & \lambda \geqslant \gamma_i, \end{cases}$$

where $t_i = t_i(c_1)$ and $\gamma_i = \gamma_i(c_1)$ are given by

$$t_i := \tfrac{1}{2}\sqrt{(\mu_i - c_1)^2 + \sigma_i^2},\ \ \gamma_i := \tfrac{(\mu_i - c_1)^2 + \sigma_i^2}{2|\mu_i - c_1|},\ \ 0 < t_i < \gamma_i \leqslant \infty\ \ (i = 1, \ldots, n). \tag{5.3}$$

Each function u_i is continuously differentiable with derivative

$$u_i'(\lambda) = \begin{cases} 0, & 0 < \lambda \leqslant t_i, \\ 1 - \frac{(\mu_i - c_1)^2 + \sigma_i^2}{4\lambda^2}, & t_i \leqslant \lambda < \gamma_i, \\ \frac{1}{2}\Big(1 + \frac{\lambda - |\mu_i - c_1|}{\sqrt{(\lambda - |\mu_i - c_1|)^2 + \sigma_i^2}}\Big), & \lambda \geqslant \gamma_i, \end{cases} \quad i = 1, \ldots, n. \tag{5.4}$$

Obviously, $u_i(\lambda)$ is constant (equal to $2t_i$) in the interval $(0, t_i]$ and then it is strictly increasing; its non-decreasing continuous derivative $u_i'(\lambda)$ satisfies $0 \leqslant u_i'(\lambda) < 1$ for all λ, and $\lim_{\lambda\to\infty} u_i'(\lambda) = 1$. It follows that

$$\psi_n'(\lambda) = -(n-2) + \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n u_i'(\lambda)$$

is non-decreasing and, thus, ψ_n is convex. Let $t_{1:n}, \ldots, t_{n:n}$ be the ordered values of $t_1, \ldots, t_n$. Noting that $n \geqslant 3$ and $0 < t_{1:n} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant t_{n:n} < \infty$, we see that $\psi_n'(\lambda) = -(n-2) < 0$ for $\lambda \leqslant t_{1:n}$, and the function ψ_n is strictly decreasing in the interval $(0, t_{1:n}]$. Also, $\psi_n(\lambda)$ is strictly convex in the interval $(t_{1:n}, \infty)$, because $\psi_n'(\lambda)$ is strictly increasing in that interval. Observe that ψ_n is eventually strictly increasing: $\lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \psi_n'(\lambda) = -(n-2) + \sum_{i=1}^n \lim_{\lambda\to\infty} u_i'(\lambda) = 2$. It follows that $\psi_n(\lambda)$ attains its minimum value at a unique point $\lambda = \lambda_1 > t_{1:n}$; clearly, $\lambda_1 = \lambda_1(c_1)$ is the unique solution to the equation $\psi_n'(\lambda) = 0$, $0 < \lambda < \infty$.

Lemma 5.1. Let $n \geqslant 3$ and fix an arbitrary $c_1 \in \mathbb{R}$. The function $\psi_n : (0, \infty) \to (0, \infty)$, with $\psi_n(\lambda) := \phi_n(c_1, \lambda)$, attains its minimum value at a unique point $\lambda_1 = \lambda_1(c_1)$. The minimizing point λ_1 is the unique solution of the equation

$$\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n u_i'(\lambda) = n - 2, \quad t_{n-1:n} < \lambda < \sum_{i=1}^n t_i, \tag{5.5}$$

where $t_i = t_i(c_1)$ are as in (5.3), $0 < t_{1:n} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant t_{n:n}$ are the ordered values of t_i in (5.3), and the functions $u_i'(\lambda)$ are given by (5.4).

Proof: It remains to verify that the unique solution, $\lambda = \lambda_1$, of $\sum_{i=1}^n u_i'(\lambda) = n - 2$ lies in the interval $(t_{n-1:n}, \sum_{i=1}^n t_i)$. First observe that if $\lambda \leqslant t_{n-1:n}$, then we can find two indices $s \neq r$ with $\lambda \leqslant t_s$ and $\lambda \leqslant t_r$. Since $u_r'(\lambda) = u_s'(\lambda) = 0$, the sum $\sum_{i=1}^n u_i'(\lambda)$ contains at most $n-2$ strictly positive terms $u_i'(\lambda)$; from $u_i'(\lambda) < 1$ it follows that $\sum_{i=1}^n u_i'(\lambda) < n - 2$. This shows that $\lambda_1 > t_{n-1:n}$. On the other hand, we observe that $\lim_{\lambda\searrow 0} \psi_n(\lambda) = 2\sum_{i=1}^n t_i$. Thus, $\psi_n(\lambda_1) \leqslant 2\sum_{i=1}^n t_i$ (because $\lambda = \lambda_1$ minimizes $\psi_n(\lambda)$). However, we know that $\phi_n(c, \lambda) > 2\lambda$ for all $(c, \lambda) \in T$; thus, $2\sum_{i=1}^n t_i \geqslant \psi_n(\lambda_1) = \phi_n(c_1, \lambda_1) > 2\lambda_1$. $\square$

Remark 5.1. Fix a point $(c_1,\lambda_1)\in T_0$ and define the following (possibly empty) sets of indices:

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &:= \big\{i\in\{1,\dots,n\} : (\mu_i-c_1)^2+\sigma_i^2 \geqslant 4\lambda_1^2\big\} = \{i : \lambda_1 \leqslant t_i\},\\
I_2 &:= \big\{i\in\{1,\dots,n\} : 2\lambda_1|\mu_i-c_1| < (\mu_i-c_1)^2+\sigma_i^2 < 4\lambda_1^2\big\} = \{i : t_i < \lambda_1 < \gamma_i\},\\
I_3 &:= \big\{i\in\{1,\dots,n\} : (\mu_i-c_1)^2+\sigma_i^2 \leqslant 2\lambda_1(\mu_i-c_1)\big\} = \{i : \lambda_1 \geqslant \gamma_i \text{ and } \mu_i > c_1\},\\
I_4 &:= \big\{i\in\{1,\dots,n\} : (\mu_i-c_1)^2+\sigma_i^2 \leqslant 2\lambda_1(c_1-\mu_i)\big\} = \{i : \lambda_1 \geqslant \gamma_i \text{ and } \mu_i < c_1\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

By definition, $I_i\cap I_j=\emptyset$ for $i\neq j$ and $I_1\cup I_2\cup I_3\cup I_4=\{1,\dots,n\}$. Since $(c_1,\lambda_1)\in T_0$ it follows that λ_1 must solves (5.5) (for this particular value of c_1), that is,

$$\sum_{i\in I_2}\Big\{1-\frac{(\mu_i-c_1)^2+\sigma_i^2}{4\lambda_1^2}\Big\}+\sum_{i\in I_3\cup I_4}\frac{1}{2}\Big\{1+\frac{\lambda_1-|\mu_i-c_1|}{\sqrt{(\lambda_1-|\mu_i-c_1|)^2+\sigma_i^2}}\Big\}=n-2,$$

where an empty sum should be treated as zero. Observe that all summands are (strictly positive and) strictly less than 1; thus, $N(I_2)+N(I_3)+N(I_4)\geqslant n-1$, and it follows that $N(I_1)\leqslant 1$, where $N(I)$ denotes the cardinality of I. Furthermore, $(c,\lambda)=(c_1,\lambda_1)$ is a solution to $\frac{\partial}{\partial c}\phi_n(c,\lambda)=0$. Using $\frac{\partial}{\partial c}\phi_n(c,\lambda)=-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n U_1\big(\frac{\mu_i-c}{\lambda},\frac{\sigma_i}{\lambda}\big)$ and the explicit form of U_1, given by (A.2), we obtain

$$\textstyle\sum_{i\in I_1}\frac{\mu_i-c_1}{\sqrt{(\mu_i-c_1)^2+\sigma_i^2}}+\sum_{i\in I_2}\frac{\mu_i-c_1}{2\lambda_1}+\sum_{i\in I_3\cup I_4}\frac{\operatorname{sign}(\mu_i-c_1)}{2}\Big\{1+\frac{|\mu_i-c_1|-\lambda_1}{\sqrt{(|\mu_i-c_1|-\lambda_1)^2+\sigma_i^2}}\Big\}=0. \tag{5.7}$$

This equality shows that $N(I_3)\leqslant n-1$ and $N(I_4)\leqslant n-1$; for if, e.g., $N(I_3)=n$ then we would have $I_1=I_2=I_4=\emptyset$ and, since $\mu_i>c_1$ whenever $i\in I_3$, the above equation leads to the (obviously impossible) relation

$$\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{2}\Big\{1+\frac{(\mu_i-c_1)-\lambda_1}{\sqrt{((\mu_i-c_1)-\lambda_1)^2+\sigma_i^2}}\Big\}=0.$$

We have thus concluded the following key-property of a minimizing point:

$$\text{If } (c_1,\lambda_1)\in T_0 \text{ then } \max\big\{N(I_3),N(I_4)\big\}\leqslant n-1 \text{ and } N(I_1)\leqslant 1. \tag{5.8}$$

Most cases suggested by (5.8) may appear for some values of $\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ (one of the rare exceptions is $N(I_1)=N(I_2)=0$, $\max\{N(I_3),N(I_4)\}=n-1$). Note that Theorem 3.1 is, in fact, concerned with the particular situation where $N(I_2)=n$ (thus, $N(I_1)=N(I_3)=N(I_4)=0$). It is, essentially, the unique situation in which the AG_n bound is tight (plus boundary subcases). Due to (5.8), it seems that this particular (but plausible) case is quite restricted.

Behind the tedious calculations, the rough meaning of the argument the led to (5.8), is the following: For a particular (c,λ) to be optimal (i.e., to minimize ϕ_n) it is necessary that c is not "too far away" from the μ_i's and λ is not "too small" or "too large" compared to $\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\sigma_i$. In particular, (5.7) shows that an optimal c can never lie outside the interval $\big[\min_i\{\mu_i\},\max_i\{\mu_i\}\big]$, and it is located in an interior point when the μ_i's are not all equal; of course this fact is intuitively obvious.

Lemma 5.2. If the set T_0 of (5.2) contains two different elements, then it must be a compact line segment which is not parallel to the λ-axis. That is, T_0 has to be of the form $T_0=[\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}]=\{\boldsymbol{x}+t(\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{x}),0\leqslant t\leqslant 1\}$, for some $\boldsymbol{x}=(c_1,\lambda_1)\in T$ and $\boldsymbol{y}=(c_2,\lambda_2)\in T$ with $c_1\neq c_2$.

Lemma 5.3. Let $A_0=(c_0,\lambda_0)\neq A_1=(c_1,\lambda_1)$ be two points in T. Fix $\mu\in\mathbb{R}$, $\sigma>0$ and consider the points $B_0=\left(\frac{\mu-c_0}{\lambda_0},\frac{\sigma}{\lambda_0}\right)\in T$, $B_1=\left(\frac{\mu-c_1}{\lambda_1},\frac{\sigma}{\lambda_1}\right)\in T$. Let $A=(c,\lambda)$ and $B=\left(\frac{\mu-c}{\lambda},\frac{\sigma}{\lambda}\right)$. As the point A is moving linearly in the line segment $[A_0,A_1]$ (from A_0 to A_1), the point $B=B(A)$ is moving continuously in the line segment $[B_0,B_1]$ (from B_0 to B_1).

We are now ready to state the conclusion of the present section.

Theorem 5.1. If $n\geqslant 3$ then for any given values of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$, there exists a unique solution $(c,\lambda)=(c_0,\lambda_0)$ of (5.1), and

$$\phi_n(c,\lambda)\geqslant\phi_n(c_0,\lambda_0)\quad\text{for all }(c,\lambda)\in\mathbb{R}\times(0,\infty),\tag{5.9}$$

with equality if and only if $(c,\lambda)=(c_0,\lambda_0)$.

Remark 5.2. For $n=2$, Theorem 5.1 (as well as several conclusions of the present section) is no longer true. It is again true that the convex function $\phi_2(c,\lambda)$ attains its minimum value, $\rho_2=\sqrt{(\mu_2-\mu_1)^2+(\sigma_1+\sigma_2)^2}$, at the solutions of the system (5.1), but now T_0 is not a singleton: it contains points arbitrarily close to the boundary of the domain of ϕ_2. More precisely, one can verify that for $n=2$, the exact set of minimizing points is the line segment $T_0=\{(c_0,\lambda);0<\lambda\leqslant\lambda_0\}$, where

$$c_0=\tfrac{\sigma_1}{\sigma_1+\sigma_2}\mu_2+\tfrac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1+\sigma_2}\mu_1,\quad \lambda_0=\tfrac{\rho_2}{2(\sigma_1+\sigma_2)}\min\{\sigma_1,\sigma_2\}.$$

However, the set $\mathscr{E}_2(\mu_1,\mu_2,\sigma_1,\sigma_2)$ is a singleton, and this fact can be seen directly (see Section 7); thus, the above calculation is completely unnecessary. Also, it is worth pointing out that, for $n=2$, $N(I_1)=2=n$ (compare with (5.8)).

6 Tightness and characterization of extremal random vectors

Let $n\geqslant 3$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ be fixed (with $0<\sigma_i<\infty$ for all i). Let (c,λ) be the unique solution of (5.1). With the help of (c,λ) we shall give a complete description of the set $\mathscr{E}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ of extremal random vectors in $\mathscr{F}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\sigma})$. These are the random vectors $\boldsymbol{X}$ satisfying $\mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{X}=\boldsymbol{\mu}$, $\mathrm{Var}\boldsymbol{X}=\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2$ and $\mathbb{E}R_n(\boldsymbol{X})=\rho_n=\rho_n(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\sigma})$, where

$$\rho_n:=\phi_n(c,\lambda)=-(n-2)\lambda+\tfrac{\lambda}{2}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n U\left(\frac{\mu_i-c}{\lambda},\frac{\sigma_i}{\lambda}\right);\tag{6.1}$$

recall that $U(\cdot,\cdot)$ is given by (2.6). The construction, though more complicated, follows parallel arguments as for the attainability of the AG_n bound (Theorem 3.1).

We start by considering the partition $I_1,\ldots,I_4$ of $\{1,\ldots,n\}$ as in (5.6), and the corresponding cardinalities $n_1,\ldots,n_4$. The main difference from Remark 5.1 is that, now, each I_j has been stabilized, because (c,λ) is unique; thus, one has to substitute $c_1=c$ and $\lambda_1=\lambda$ in (5.6). Clearly some of the sets I_j may be empty; then $n_j=0$. The situation with all I_j being nonempty may also appear; this is the case, e.g., for $\boldsymbol{\mu}=(4,0,4,0)$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}=(10,5,1,1)$. From Remark 5.1 (see (5.8)) we know that n_1 n_2, n_3, n_4 (with $n_j\geqslant 0$, $\sum n_j=n$) cannot be completely arbitrary; they have to satisfy the restrictions:

$$n_3=N(I_3)\leqslant n-1,\ \ n_4=N(I_4)\leqslant n-1,\ \ n_1=N(I_1)\leqslant 1.\tag{6.2}$$

Other impossible cases are given by $n_3 = 1, n_4 = n-1$ and $n_3 = n-1, n_4 = 1$; this is a by-product of Lemma 6.1, below.

For notational simplicity it is helpful to consider the following numbers ξ_i, θ_i:

$$\xi_i := \begin{cases} \mu_i - c, & i \in I_1 \cup I_2; \\ \mu_i - c - \lambda, & i \in I_3; \\ c - \mu_i - \lambda, & i \in I_4; \end{cases} \qquad \theta_i := \begin{cases} \sqrt{(\mu_i - c)^2 + \sigma_i^2}, & i \in I_1 \cup I_2; \\ \sqrt{(\mu_i - c - \lambda)^2 + \sigma_i^2}, & i \in I_3; \\ \sqrt{(c - \mu_i - \lambda)^2 + \sigma_i^2}, & i \in I_4. \end{cases} \tag{6.3}$$

We note that $|\xi_i| < \theta_i$ for all i and $2\lambda|\xi_i| < \theta_i^2 < 4\lambda^2$ for all $i \in I_2$ (if any). Following Corollary 2.1 we define the probabilities

$$\begin{array}{llll} p_i^- := \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \frac{\xi_i}{\theta_i}\right), & p_i^o := 0, & p_i^+ := \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + \frac{\xi_i}{\theta_i}\right), & i \in I_1; \\ p_i^- := \frac{1}{8\lambda^2}\left[\theta_i^2 - 2\lambda\xi_i\right], & p_i^o := 1 - \frac{\theta_i^2}{4\lambda^2}, & p_i^+ := \frac{1}{8\lambda^2}\left[\theta_i^2 + 2\lambda\xi_i\right], & i \in I_2; \\ p_i^- := 0, & p_i^o := \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \frac{\xi_i}{\theta_i}\right), & p_i^+ := \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + \frac{\xi_i}{\theta_i}\right), & i \in I_3; \\ p_i^- := \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + \frac{\xi_i}{\theta_i}\right), & p_i^o := \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \frac{\xi_i}{\theta_i}\right), & p_i^+ := 0, & i \in I_4, \end{array} \tag{6.4}$$

and the corresponding (univariate) supporting points

$$\begin{array}{llll} x_i^- := c - \theta_i, & & x_i^+ := c + \theta_i, & i \in I_1; \\ x_i^- := c - 2\lambda, & x_i^o := c, & x_i^+ := c + 2\lambda, & i \in I_2; \\ & x_i^o := c + \lambda - \theta_i, & x_i^+ := c + \lambda + \theta_i, & i \in I_3; \\ x_i^- := c - \lambda - \theta_i, & x_i^o := c - \lambda + \theta_i, & & i \in I_4. \end{array} \tag{6.5}$$

By definition, each $\boldsymbol{p}_i := \left(p_i^-, p_i^o, p_i^+\right)$ is a probability vector. Clearly, one could assign an arbitrary value to a missing point, since its corresponding probability is 0. The most convenient choice is to assign the respective values $c-2\lambda$, c, $c+2\lambda$, whenever x_i^-, x_i^o, x_i^+ is not specified from (6.5). With this convention,

$$x_i^- < c - \lambda < x_i^o < c + \lambda < x_i^+, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n. \tag{6.6}$$

Let X_i be a random variable which assumes values x_i^-, x_i^o, x_i^+ with respective probabilities p_i^-, p_i^o, p_i^+. Corollary 2.1 asserts that (the distribution of) X_i is characterized be the fact that maximizes the expectation of $|(X-c)-\lambda| + |(X-c)+\lambda|$ as X varies in $\mathscr{F}_1(\mu_i, \sigma_i)$.

The following lemma provides the most fundamental tool for the main result.

Lemma 6.1. The probabilities p_i^+, p_i^- in (6.4) satisfy the relation

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i^+ = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i^- = 1. \tag{6.7}$$

Lemma 6.1 enables us to define the n-variate probability vectors

$$\boldsymbol{p}^+ = (p_1^+, \ldots, p_n^+), \quad \boldsymbol{p}^- = (p_1^-, \ldots, p_n^-). \tag{6.8}$$

By definition, $\boldsymbol{p}^+$ has its zero elements at exactly the positions i where $i \in I_4$ (if $I_4 = \emptyset$, all p_i^+'s are positive), and $\boldsymbol{p}^-$ has its zero elements at exactly the positions i where $i \in I_3$ (if any).

Proposition 6.1. Assume we are given $n \geqslant 3$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$. Then, (i) and (ii) are equivalent:

(i) We can find a random vector $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathscr{F}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ such that $\mathbb{E}R_n = \rho_n$.

(ii) There exists a $n \times n$ probability matrix $Q \in \mathscr{M}(\boldsymbol{p}^+, \boldsymbol{p}^-)$ such that $q_{ii} = 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.

Moreover, with $\mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{X})$ denoting the probability law of the random vector $\boldsymbol{X}$, the correspondence $\mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{X}) \rightleftarrows Q$ is a bijection; the explicit formula for the transformation $Q = (q_{ij}) \mapsto \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{X})$ is given by

$$\mathbb{P}[\boldsymbol{X} = \boldsymbol{x}_{ij}] = q_{ij}, \text{ where } \boldsymbol{x}_{ij} := \big(x_1^o, \ldots, x_{i-1}^o, x_i^+, x_{i+1}^o, \ldots, x_{j-1}^o, x_j^-, x_{j+1}^o, \ldots, x_n^o\big), \quad i \neq j, \;\; i, j = 1, \ldots, n. \tag{6.9}$$

The main result of the present work reads as follows:

Theorem 6.1. Let $n \geqslant 3$, $\mu_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sigma_i > 0$ $(i = 1, \ldots, n)$. Then,
(a)

$$\sup \mathbb{E}R_n = \rho_n, \tag{6.10}$$

where the supremum is taken over $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathscr{F}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ and $\rho_n = \rho_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ is given by (6.1), with $(c, \lambda) = (c(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}), \lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}))$ being the unique solution to the system of equations (5.1).

(b) The set $\mathscr{E}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ is nonempty. Any extremal $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathscr{E}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ is produced by (6.9), with x_i^-, x_i^o, x_i^+ as in (6.5), and corresponds uniquely to a $n \times n$ probability matrix $Q \in \mathscr{M}(\boldsymbol{p}^+, \boldsymbol{p}^-)$ with zero diagonal entries, where $\boldsymbol{p}^+$, $\boldsymbol{p}^-$ are given by (6.8).

Proof: From Theorem 2.1 we know that $\mathbb{E}R_n \leqslant \rho_n$ and it suffices to prove (b). In view of Proposition 6.1, it remains to verify that the class of $n \times n$ probability matrices with zero diagonal entries and marginals $\boldsymbol{p}^+$, $\boldsymbol{p}^-$ is nonempty. However, this fact follows immediately from Lemma 3.1, because $\max_i\{p_i^+ + p_i^-\} \leqslant 1$ (see (6.4)), and the proof is complete. □

Remark 6.1. Since $\mathbb{E}R_n(\boldsymbol{X}) = \rho_n$ for any $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathscr{E}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$,

$$\rho_n = \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n \{(x_i^+ - c)p_i^+ + (c - x_i^-)p_i^-\}.$$

Corollary 6.1. If $I_1 \neq \emptyset$ (see (5.6)) then $I_1 = \{k\}$ for some $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, and the equality in (6.10) characterizes the random vector $\boldsymbol{X}$ with probability law

$$\mathbb{P}[\boldsymbol{X} = \boldsymbol{x}_{ik}] = p_i^+, \;\; \mathbb{P}[\boldsymbol{X} = \boldsymbol{x}_{ki}] = p_i^-, \;\; i \neq k, \; i = 1, \ldots, n. \tag{6.11}$$

Proof: From (6.2) we know that $N(I_1) \leqslant 1$, and thus, $I_1 = \{k\}$ for some k. Since $k \in I_1$, (6.4) shows that $\max_i\{p_i^+ + p_i^-\} = p_k^+ + p_k^- = 1$. [Note that, by Lemma 6.1, $\sum_{i \neq k} p_i^- + \sum_{i \neq k} p_i^+ = (1 - p_k^-) + (1 - p_k^+) = 1$ and, hence, (6.11) defines a probability law.] Lemma 3.1 implies uniqueness of Q, hence of $\mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{X})$ (see (6.9)). It is easily seen that the matrix Q, obtained by (6.11) through (A.9), is indeed the unique probability matrix with vanishing diagonal entries and marginals $\boldsymbol{p}^+$, $\boldsymbol{p}^-$. □

Corollary 6.1 implies uniqueness (denoted by (U)) for the second counterpart of the bound (3.4) in Example 3.2. It should be noted that the converse of Corollary 6.1 does not hold; that

is, the condition $I_1 \neq \emptyset$ is not necessary for concluding uniqueness of the extremal random vector $\boldsymbol{X}$. A particular example was given by Remark 3.1.

Clearly, the most interesting situations in practice arise when $I_1 = \emptyset$. In such cases it is fairly expected that there will be infinitely many extremal vectors, as in Theorem 3.1. This is, indeed, true in general, but not always. Lemma 3.1 guarantees infiniteness (denoted by (I)) only if all p_i^+, p_i^- are nonzero, and this corresponds to the quite restricted case where $I_2 = \{1,\dots,n\}$. Of course, given the existence of two extremal vectors, one can deduce (I) by considering convex combinations of the corresponding matrices; cf. Example 3.1. If $I_1 = \emptyset$, the complete distinction between (U) and (I) depends upon the values of n, $n_3 = N(I_3)$ and $n_4 = N(I_4)$ (see (5.6) and (6.2)); and if $n_3 = n_4 = 0$ we already know that (I) results.

We briefly discuss all remaining situations where $I_1 = \emptyset$: If $n_2 = N(I_2) = 0$ and $n_3 \geqslant 2$, $n_4 \geqslant 2$, it is obvious that (I) holds; note that $n_3 = 1, n_4 = n-1$ and $n_3 = n-1, n_4 = 1$ are impossible by Lemma 6.1. If $n_2 = n_3 = n_4 = 1$ or $n_2 = 2, n_3 = 1, n_4 = 0$ or $n_2 = 2, n_3 = 0, n_4 = 1$ then we are in (U), while (I) results if $n_2 = n_3 = 1, n_4 \geqslant 2$ or $n_2 = n_4 = 1, n_3 \geqslant 2$. If $n_2 = 1, n_3 \geqslant 2, n_4 \geqslant 2$ then we get (I), as well as in all remaining cases where $n_2 \geqslant 2, n_3 \geqslant 0, n_4 \geqslant 0$.

The final conclusion is as follows: If $I_1 = \emptyset$, the situations where the extremal distribution is uniquely defined are described by $n_2 = n_3 = n_4 = 1$ or $n_2 = 2, n_3 = 1, n_4 = 0$ or $n_2 = 2, n_3 = 0, n_4 = 1$ (and thus, $n = 3$); this provides an explanation to Remark 3.1. However, we note that knowledge of the values n_j actually requires knowledge of the region where the optimal (c,λ) appears, and this may be, or may not be, an easy task for particular $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$.

Remark 6.2. The range $R_n(\boldsymbol{X})$ of an extremal vector $\boldsymbol{X}$ need not be a degenerate random variable. An example is provided by $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (-2,0,2)$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (1,3,1)$. Then, $n_1 = 0$, $n_2 = n_3 = n_4 = 1$ and it can be shown that

$$\lambda \approx 1.737, \quad \rho_3 = \tfrac{64\lambda^3 - 72\lambda - 81}{4\lambda(4\lambda^2 - 9)} \approx 6.066$$

(λ is the unique solution of $4\lambda^2(2-\lambda) = (4\lambda^2 - 9)\sqrt{\lambda^2 - 4\lambda + 5}$, and this reduces to a four-degree polynomial equation). The range R_3 of the unique extremal vector assumes values $2\lambda + \frac{\lambda(8\lambda-9)}{4\lambda^2-9} \approx 5.542$ and $\frac{2\lambda(8\lambda-9)}{4\lambda^2-9} \approx 6.245$ with respective probabilities $\frac{9}{4\lambda^2} \approx .254$ and $1 - \frac{9}{4\lambda^2} \approx .746$. However, the improvement over the bound $AG_3 = \sqrt{38} \approx 6.164$ is negligible. As a general observation, even for small n, the value of ρ_n is difficult to evaluate when more than two index sets I_j are nonempty.

Example 6.1. *Homoscedastic observations from two balanced groups.* Let $n = 2k$, $\sigma_i^2 = \sigma^2$ and $\mu_i = -\mu$ or μ according to $i \leqslant k$ or $i > k$, respectively ($\mu \geqslant 0$). The Arnold-Groeneveld bound (1.4) takes here the form

$$\mathbb{E}R_{2k} \leqslant AG_{2k} = 2\sqrt{k(\mu^2 + \sigma^2)},$$

and it is tight if $\mu \leqslant \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{k-1}}$ (in particular, if $n = 2$ or $\mu = 0$). Also, we know from Theorem 3.1 the nature of the random vectors that attain the equality. However, for $\mu \geqslant \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{k-1}}$ one finds $N(I_3) = N(I_4) = k$, and the tight bound of Theorem 6.1 becomes

$$\mathbb{E}R_{2k} \leqslant \rho_{2k} = 2\mu + 2\sigma\sqrt{k-1} \quad \big(\mu \geqslant \tfrac{\sigma}{\sqrt{k-1}}\big);$$

note that ρ_{2k} is equal to AG_{2k} only in the boundary case $\sigma=\mu\sqrt{k-1}$. For $\mu\geqslant\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{k-1}}$ the nature of extremal random vectors is different: They assume values

$$\boldsymbol{y}_{ij}=\big(-x,\ldots,-x,-y,-x,\ldots,-x\,;\,x,\ldots,x,y,x,\ldots,x\big),\ \ i,j=1,\ldots,k,$$

where $-y$ is located at the i-th place and y is located at the $(k+j)$-th place of the vector. Here, $0\leqslant x=\mu-\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{k-1}}<y=\mu+\sigma\sqrt{k-1}$. The respective probabilities $p_{ij}=\mathbb{P}[\boldsymbol{X}=\boldsymbol{y}_{ij}]$, $i,j=1,\ldots,k$, correspond to a probability matrix $P_{k\times k}$ with uniform marginals. Both limits

$$\lim_{\mu\to\infty}\tfrac{\rho_{2k}}{AG_{2k}}=\tfrac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\ \ (k,\,\sigma\text{ fixed}),\quad \lim_{k\to\infty}\tfrac{\rho_{2k}}{AG_{2k}}=\tfrac{\sigma}{\sqrt{\mu^2+\sigma^2}}\ \ (\mu,\,\sigma\text{ fixed})$$

show that, under some circumstances, the improvement that is achieved by using ρ_n instead of AG_n can become arbitrarily large.

Example 6.2. *Homoscedastic data with a single outlier.* Let $\sigma_i^2=\sigma^2$ for all i, $\mu_i=0$ ($i=1,\ldots,n-1$) and $\mu_n=\mu\geqslant 0$. Theorem 3.1 asserts that the bound

$$\mathbb{E}R_n\leqslant AG_n=\sqrt{2\tfrac{n-1}{n}\mu^2+2n\sigma^2}$$

is not tight for $n\geqslant 3$ and $\mu>\frac{n}{\sqrt{n-1}}\sigma$. The tight bound has the form

$$\mathbb{E}R_n\leqslant\rho_n=\sqrt{(n-1)(c^2+\sigma^2)}+\sqrt{(\mu-c)^2+\sigma^2},$$

where c is the unique root of the equation

$$\tfrac{c\sqrt{n-1}}{\sqrt{c^2+\sigma^2}}=\tfrac{\mu-c}{\sqrt{(\mu-c)^2+\sigma^2}},\quad 0<c<\min\big\{\tfrac{\mu}{n},\tfrac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n-2}}\big\}.$$

Although $\rho_n<AG_n$ (for $\mu\sqrt{n-1}>n\sigma$), it is not easy to make direct comparisons. However, $c^2<\frac{\sigma^2}{n-2}$ and $(\mu-c)^2<\mu^2$, so that $\rho_n<\rho_n'=\frac{n-1}{\sqrt{n-2}}\sigma+\sqrt{\mu^2+\sigma^2}$. Hence, for the (non-tight) upper bound ρ_n',

$$\lim_{\mu\to\infty}\tfrac{\rho_n'}{AG_n}=\tfrac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{2n-2}}\quad(n\geqslant 3,\ n,\sigma\text{ fixed}).$$

Remark 6.3. Example 6.2 and Remark 6.2 entail that ρ_n may have a rather complicated form when the μ_i's are not all equal. On the other hand, ρ_n becomes quite plausible in the case of equal μ_i's; see Example 3.2. This particular case is useful in concluding some facts about the behavior of ρ_n in general. Indeed, taking into account the obvious relation $U(x,y)\geqslant U(0,y)$, we see that for any given $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$,

$$\rho_n=\phi_n(c,\lambda)\geqslant-(n-2)\lambda+\tfrac{\lambda}{2}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n U\big(0,\frac{\sigma_i}{\lambda}\big)=\widehat{\phi}_n(0,\lambda)\geqslant\widehat{\rho}_n:=\inf_{x\in\mathbb{R},y>0}\widehat{\phi}_n(x,y),$$

where $\widehat{\rho}_n$ is the upper bound of Theorem 2.1, calculated under $\mu_i=\mu$ for all i, and for the given $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$. Since $\widehat{\rho}_n=\min_{y>0}\widehat{\phi}_n(0,y)$ admits a simple closed form, see (3.4), we get the following lower bound:

$$\rho_n\geqslant\widehat{\rho}_n=\begin{cases}\sqrt{2\sum_{i=1}^n\sigma_i^2}, & \text{if}\quad 2\max_i\{\sigma_i^2\}\leqslant\sum_{i=1}^n\sigma_i^2,\\ \max_i\{\sigma_i\}+\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n\sigma_i^2-\max_i\{\sigma_i^2\}}, & \text{if}\quad 2\max_i\{\sigma_i^2\}\geqslant\sum_{i=1}^n\sigma_i^2,\end{cases}\quad\text{any }\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\sigma}.$$

Since $U(x,y) > U(0,y)$ for $x \neq 0$, the equality holds only if all the μ_i's are equal. Despite its weakness, this lower bound provides an idea of what can be expected for the actual size of ρ_n. It is also helpful in giving some light to the observation that, provided the means are small compared to the variances, the AG_n bound tends to be tight. More precisely, assume that $\min_i\{\sigma_i^2\} \to \infty$ and $(\sum_{i=1}^n(\mu_i-\overline{\mu})^2)/(\sum_{i=1}^n\sigma_i^2) \to 0$ (in particular, $\max_i|\mu_i-\overline{\mu}| \leqslant C < \infty$ suffices for this). Then, the homogeneity assumption $\max_i\{\sigma_i^2\} \leqslant (n-1)\min_i\{\sigma_i^2\}$ is sufficient for the asymptotic tightness of the AG_n bound (for fixed $n \geqslant 3$). Indeed, from this assumption we get $\sum_{i=1}^n\sigma_i^2 \geqslant \max_i\{\sigma_i^2\} + (n-1)\min_i\{\sigma_i^2\} \geqslant 2\max\{\sigma_i^2\}$, and thus, $\widehat{\rho}_n = \sqrt{2\sum_{i=1}^n\sigma_i^2}$. Hence,

$$1 \geqslant \Big(\frac{\rho_n}{AG_n}\Big)^2 \geqslant \Big(\frac{\widehat{\rho}_n}{AG_n}\Big)^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n\sigma_i^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n\{(\mu_i-\overline{\mu})^2+\sigma_i^2\}} = \frac{1}{1+(\sum_{i=1}^n(\mu_i-\overline{\mu})^2)/(\sum_{i=1}^n\sigma_i^2)} \to 1.$$

Therefore, under the above circumstances, the improvement achieved by using ρ_n instead of AG_n becomes negligible.

7 The case $n=2$ and further remarks

For $n=2$ the bound ρ_2 admits a closed form. More precisely, from Theorem 2.1,

$$\mathbb{E}R_2 \leqslant \rho_2, \quad \text{where } \rho_2 := \inf_{c\in\mathbb{R},\lambda>0}\phi_2(c,\lambda) = \sqrt{(\mu_1-\mu_2)^2+(\sigma_1+\sigma_2)^2}; \tag{7.1}$$

see Remark 5.2. The inequality (7.1) is tight, since the equality is attained by (and characterizes) the random pair (X_1,X_2) with distribution given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\big[X_1 = \tfrac{\sigma_2\mu_1+\sigma_1\mu_2}{\sigma_1+\sigma_2} + \tfrac{\sigma_1}{\sigma_1+\sigma_2}\rho_2,\ X_2 = \tfrac{\sigma_2\mu_1+\sigma_1\mu_2}{\sigma_1+\sigma_2} - \tfrac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1+\sigma_2}\rho_2\big] &= \tfrac{1}{2}\big(1+\tfrac{\mu_1-\mu_2}{\rho_2}\big),\\ \mathbb{P}\big[X_1 = \tfrac{\sigma_2\mu_1+\sigma_1\mu_2}{\sigma_1+\sigma_2} - \tfrac{\sigma_1}{\sigma_1+\sigma_2}\rho_2,\ X_2 = \tfrac{\sigma_2\mu_1+\sigma_1\mu_2}{\sigma_1+\sigma_2} + \tfrac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1+\sigma_2}\rho_2\big] &= \tfrac{1}{2}\big(1+\tfrac{\mu_2-\mu_1}{\rho_2}\big).\end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

Therefore, $\mathscr{E}_2(\boldsymbol{\mu},\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ is a singleton. Also, $AG_2 = \sqrt{(\mu_1-\mu_2)^2+2\sigma_1^2+2\sigma_2^2}$, and it is worth pointing out that the bound AG_2 is tight if and only if $\sigma_1=\sigma_2$. Another observation is that the extremal random vector for the expected range coincides with the (unique) extremal random vector for the expected maximum (see (1.5)). However, this is not a coincidence. In view of the obvious relationship

$$R_2 = |X_1-X_2| = 2\max\{X_1,X_2\} - X_1 - X_2 = 2X_{2:2} - X_1 - X_2, \tag{7.3}$$

a bound for the maximum can be translated to a bound for the range, and vice-versa (provided that the expectations, μ_1,μ_2, of X_1,X_2, are known). In this sense, the bound ρ_2 turns to be a particular case of the results given by Bertsimas, Natarajan and Teo (2004, 2006), namely

$$\rho_2 = \sup\mathbb{E}R_2 = \sup\mathbb{E}\{2X_{2:2}-X_1-X_2\} = 2\sup\mathbb{E}X_{2:2} - \mu_1 - \mu_2 = 2BNT_2 - \mu_1 - \mu_2,$$

and the equality characterizes the same extremal distribution as for the maximum. Consequently, it is of some interest to observe that the bound BNT_2 admits a closed form, namely,

$$BNT_2 = \tfrac{1}{2}(\mu_1+\mu_2) + \tfrac{1}{2}\sqrt{(\mu_1-\mu_2)^2+(\sigma_1+\sigma_2)^2}.$$

Note also that the BNT_2–bound improves the corresponding Arnold-Groeneveld bound (1.3) for the expected maximum only in the case where $\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2$.

It is also worth pointing out that a particular application of the main result in Papadatos (2001a) yields an even better (than BNT_2, AG_2 and ρ_2) bound. Indeed, setting $\rho := \mathrm{Corr}(X_1, X_2)$, it follows from Papadatos' results that for any $(X_1, X_2) \in \mathscr{F}_2(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$,

$$\mathbb{E}R_2 \leqslant \gamma_2 := \sqrt{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2 + (\sigma_1 + \sigma_2)^2 - 2(1+\rho)\sigma_1\sigma_2}. \tag{7.4}$$

Obviously, $\gamma_2 \leqslant \rho_2$ with equality if and only if $\rho = -1$. This inequality explains the fact that the extremal random pair (X_1, X_2) (that attains the bounds ρ_2 and BNT_2) has correlation $\rho = -1$; see (7.2).

The preceding inequalities have some interest because they provide a basis for the investigation of the dependence structure of an ordered pair. This kind of investigation is particularly useful for its application to reliability systems; see Navarro and Balakrishnan (2010). On the other hand, in view of the obvious facts $X_{1:2} + X_{2:2} = X_1 + X_2$ and $X_{1:2}X_{2:2} = X_1X_2$, we get the relation

$$\mathrm{Cov}[X_{1:2}, X_{2:2}] = \rho\sigma_1\sigma_2 - \tfrac{1}{4}(\mu_2 - \mu_1)^2 + \tfrac{1}{4}(\mathbb{E}R_2)^2, \;\; (X_1, X_2) \in \mathscr{F}_2(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}), \tag{7.5}$$

where $\rho = \mathrm{Corr}(X_1, X_2)$. Thus, any bound (upper or lower) for $\mathbb{E}R_2$ can be translated to a bound for $\mathrm{Cov}(X_{1:2}, X_{2:2})$ as well as for $\mathbb{E}X_{2:2}$; see Papathanasiou (1990), Balakrishnan and Balasubramanian (1993). Therefore, it is of some interest to know whether the bound in (7.4) is tight for given ρ. This is indeed the case but, to the best of our knowledge, this elementary fact does not seem to be well-known, and we shall provide a simple proof here. To this end, let $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \mu_2)$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$ (with $\sigma_1 > 0$, $\sigma_2 > 0$), $-1 \leqslant \rho \leqslant 1$, and define the section

$$\mathscr{F}_2(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}; \rho) := \big\{(X_1, X_2) \in \mathscr{F}_2(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}) : \mathrm{Corr}(X_1, X_2) = \rho\big\}.$$

Then we have the following.

Theorem 7.1. As (X_1, X_2) varies in $\mathscr{F}_2(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}; \rho)$,

$$\inf \mathbb{E}R_2 = |\mu_2 - \mu_1|, \quad \sup \mathbb{E}R_2 = \sqrt{(\mu_2 - \mu_1)^2 + (\sigma_1 + \sigma_2)^2 - 2(1+\rho)\sigma_1\sigma_2}. \tag{7.6}$$

Remark 7.1. From the proof it follows that (the probability law of) the extremal vector (X_1, X_2) $\in \mathscr{F}_2(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}; \rho)$ that attains the equality in (7.4) is unique if and only if either (i) $\rho = -1$ or (ii) $\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2$ and $\rho = 1$. With this in mind, let us keep $\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2$ constant, and write $\gamma_2 = \gamma_2(\rho)$ for the quantity defined by (7.4). Then, $\gamma_2(\rho)$ is strictly decreasing in ρ (recall that $\sigma_1 > 0$, $\sigma_2 > 0$), attaining its maximum value at $\rho = -1$. By definition, $\gamma_2(-1) = \rho_2$ (see (7.1)), and thus, for the equality $\mathbb{E}R_2 = \rho_2$ it is necessary that $\rho = -1$. This observation verifies that the unique distribution that attains the equality in (7.1) is the BNT_2–distribution, given by (7.2).

In view of (7.3), (7.5), the following result is straightforward from Theorem 7.1.

Corollary 7.1. Let $(X_1, X_2) \in \mathscr{F}_2(\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2; \rho)$ with $\sigma_1 > 0, \sigma_2 > 0$. Then,

$$\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\} \leqslant \mathbb{E}\big\{\max\{X_1, X_2\}\big\} \leqslant \tfrac{1}{2}(\mu_1 + \mu_2) + \tfrac{1}{2}\sqrt{(\mu_2 - \mu_1)^2 + \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 - 2\rho\sigma_1\sigma_2},$$

$$\rho\sigma_1\sigma_2 \leqslant \mathrm{Cov}\big[\min\{X_1, X_2\}, \max\{X_1, X_2\}\big] \leqslant \tfrac{1}{4}\big(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 + 2\rho\sigma_1\sigma_2\big).$$

All bounds are best possible.

It is worth pointing out that, as Corollary 7.1 shows, the covariance of an ordered pair can never be smaller than the covariance of the observations and, in particular, an ordered pair formed from non-negatively correlated observations is non-negatively correlated. While these facts, as well as the lower covariance bound of an ordered pair, are well-known (see eq.'s (2.9), (2.11) in Navarro and Balakrishnan (2010)), the upper bound seems to be of some interest.

There are some propositions and questions for further research. An obvious one is in extending the main result of Theorem 6.1 and of (1.5) to more general L-statistics. Recall that the tight bound for any L-statistic under the i.d. assumption is known from the work of Rychlik (1993b). However, Rychlik's result is not applicable if arbitrary multivariate distributions are allowed for the data.

A second one concerns extension to other L-statistics of the bounds given in Corollary 7.1 and Theorem 7.1 for $n \geqslant 3$, noting that these bounds have a different nature, because they use covariance information from the data. It is particularly interest to know the tight bounds for the the expected range and the expected maximum under mean-variance-covariance information on the observations. Non-tight bounds of this form are given, e.g., in Aven (1985), Papadatos (2001a). It is worth pointing out that some sophisticated optimization techniques (semidefinite programming) have been fruitfully applied to this kind of problems, especially for the maximum and the range. The interested reader is referred to Natarajan and Teo (2014), where some financial applications of the range bounds are also included. However, note that one would hardly discover the simple formula (7.4) from the (reduced) semidefinite program in Natarajan and Teo's Section 4.

A lot of research has been devoted in deriving distribution and expectation bounds for L-statistics based on random vectors with given marginals; see Arnold (1980, 1985, 1988), Caraux and Gascuel (1992), Gascuel and Caraux (1992), Meilijson and Nadas (1979), Papadatos (2001b), Rychlik (1992b, 1993a, 1994, 1995, 1998, 2007), Gajek and Rychlik (1996, 1998). The results by Lai and Robbins (1976), Nagaraja (1981) and Arnold and Balakrishnan (1989) show that some deterministic inequalities play an important role in the derivation of tight bounds for L-statistics; see Rychlik (1992a). On the other hand, the deterministic inequality (2.3) can be viewed as a range analogue of the inequality from Lai and Robbins (1976). Noting that the Lai-Robbins inequality yields the tight bound for the expected maximum under completely known marginal distributions (see Bertsimas, Natarajan and Teo (2006), Meilijson and Nadas (1979)), it would not be surprising if (2.3) could produce the best possible bound for the expected range. Thus, a natural question is whether it is true that for all multivariate vectors with given marginal distributions $F_1, \ldots, F_n$ and finite first moment,

$$\sup \mathbb{E}R_n = \inf_{c\in\mathbb{R},\lambda>0} \left\{ -(n-2)\lambda + \tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\left| (X_i - c) - \lambda \right| + \left| (X_i - c) + \lambda \right| \right] \right\}.$$

Note that the RHS is an upper bound for the LHS, and depends only on $F_1, \ldots, F_n$.

A Appendix: Proofs

Proof of Lemma 2.1: Fix $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda > 0$ and set $y_1 = c - \lambda$, $y_2 = c + \lambda$, so that $y_1 < y_2$. Observe that $R_n = X_{n:n} - X_{1:n}$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ |X_i - y_1| + |X_i - y_2| \right\} = \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ |X_{i:n} - y_1| + |X_{i:n} - y_2| \right\}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^n \big\{|X_i-y_1|+|X_i-y_2|\big\} - (n-2)(y_2-y_1) - 2R_n \\ = \sum_{i=2}^{n-1}\big\{|X_{i:n}-y_1|+|X_{i:n}-y_2|-(y_2-y_1)\big\} \\ +\big\{|X_{1:n}-y_1|+|X_{n:n}-y_1|-(X_{n:n}-X_{1:n})\big\} \\ +\big\{|X_{1:n}-y_2|+|X_{n:n}-y_2|-(X_{n:n}-X_{1:n})\big\}.\end{aligned}$$

For each $i\in\{2,\dots,n-1\}$ we have

$$y_2-y_1=|y_2-y_1|=\big|(X_{i:n}-y_1)-(X_{i:n}-y_2)\big|\leqslant \big|X_{i:n}-y_1\big|+\big|X_{i:n}-y_2\big|,$$

with equality if and only if $y_1\leqslant X_{i:n}\leqslant y_2$. Since the sum $\sum_{i=2}^{n-1}\big\{|X_{i:n}-y_1|+|X_{i:n}-y_2|-(y_2-y_1)\big\}$ contains only non-negative terms, it follows that

$$\sum_{i=2}^{n-1}\big\{|X_{i:n}-y_1|+|X_{i:n}-y_2|-(y_2-y_1)\big\}\geqslant 0,$$

with equality if and only if $y_1\leqslant X_{2:n}\leqslant\cdots\leqslant X_{n-1:n}\leqslant y_2$. Also, for $y=y_1$ or y_2,

$$X_{n:n}-X_{1:n}=\big|(X_{n:n}-y)-(X_{1:n}-y)\big|\leqslant\big|X_{1:n}-y\big|+\big|X_{n:n}-y\big|$$

with equality if and only if $X_{1:n}\leqslant y\leqslant X_{n:n}$. Therefore,

$$-2R_n-(n-2)(y_2-y_1)+\sum_{i=1}^n\big\{|X_i-y_1|+|X_i-y_2|\big\}\geqslant 0$$

with equality if and only if $X_{1:n}\leqslant y_1\leqslant X_{2:n}\leqslant\cdots\leqslant X_{n-1:n}\leqslant y_2\leqslant X_{n:n}$. □

Proof of Lemma 2.2: In case $\mu^2+\sigma^2\geqslant 4$ it suffices to use the inequality

$$|X-1|+|X+1|\leqslant\sqrt{\mu^2+\sigma^2}+\tfrac{X^2}{\sqrt{\mu^2+\sigma^2}},$$

where the equality holds if and only if $X\in\{-\sqrt{\mu^2+\sigma^2},\sqrt{\mu^2+\sigma^2}\}$. Taking expectations we get

$$\mathbb{E}\big\{|X-1|+|X+1|\big\}\leqslant\sqrt{\mu^2+\sigma^2}+\tfrac{\mathbb{E}X^2}{\sqrt{\mu^2+\sigma^2}}=2\sqrt{\mu^2+\sigma^2}.$$

For equality X has to assume the values $\pm\sqrt{\mu^2+\sigma^2}$. Set $p=\mathbb{P}[X=\sqrt{\mu^2+\sigma^2}]$ so that $1-p=\mathbb{P}[X=-\sqrt{\mu^2+\sigma^2}]$. The relation $\mathbb{E}X^2=\mu^2+\sigma^2$ is satisfied for any value of $p\in[0,1]$, while the condition $\mathbb{E}X=\mu$ specifies p to be as in (a).

Next, we assume that $2|\mu|<\mu^2+\sigma^2<4$ and use the inequality

$$|X-1|+|X+1|\leqslant 2+\tfrac{1}{2}X^2,$$

in which the equality holds if and only if $X\in\{-2,0,2\}$. Taking expectations we again conclude (2.5) with $U(\mu,\sigma)$ given by the second line of (2.6). It is easy to see that the unique random variable in $\mathscr{F}_1(\mu,\sigma)$ that assumes values in the set $\{-2,0,2\}$ is the one given by (b).

Next, suppose that $\mu^2+\sigma^2\leqslant 2\mu$, and hence, $0<\mu<2$. Working as before, it suffices to take expectations in the inequality

$$|X-1|+|X+1|\leqslant 2+\tfrac{(X-1+\sqrt{(\mu-1)^2+\sigma^2})^2}{2\sqrt{(\mu-1)^2+\sigma^2}},$$

in which the equality holds if and only if $X \in \{x_1, x_2\}$, where $x_1 = 1 - \sqrt{(\mu-1)^2+\sigma^2}$, $x_2 = 1 + \sqrt{(\mu-1)^2+\sigma^2}$. Note that $0 < (\mu-1)^2+\sigma^2 = 1 - [2\mu - (\mu^2+\sigma^2)] \leqslant 1$; thus, $0 \leqslant x_1 < 1 < x_2 \leqslant 2$. Now it is easily seen that the unique random variable in $\mathscr{F}_1(\mu,\sigma)$ that assumes values in the set $\{x_1, x_2\}$ is the one given by (c). Observing that $|X-1|+|X+1|$ is even, the case $\mu^2+\sigma^2 \leqslant -2\mu$ is reduced to the previous one by considering $-X \in \mathscr{F}_1(-\mu,\sigma)$. □

Proof of Lemma 3.1: For $n = 1$ both (3.5) and (3.6) are invalid, so we have nothing to prove. For $n = 2$ the result is trivial (we have uniqueness if (3.5) is satisfied; we have equality in (3.6) whenever it is fulfilled). Assume $n \geqslant 3$ and consider the set of all probability matrices with the given marginals,

$$\mathscr{M}(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q}) = \big\{Q = (q_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n} : q_{ij} \geqslant 0, \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n q_{ij} = q_j, \sum_{j=1}^n q_{ij} = p_i \text{ for all } i,j\big\}.$$

The set $\mathscr{M}(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q})$ is nonempty since, e.g., it contains the matrix $Q = (p_i q_j)$. Also, the function $f(Q) := \operatorname{trace}(Q) = \sum_{i=1}^n q_{ii}$ is continuous with respect to the total variation distance, $d(Q,\widetilde{Q}) = \sum_{i,j} |q_{ij} - \widetilde{q}_{ij}|$ (or any other equivalent metric on $\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$). Moreover, $\mathscr{M}(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q})$ is a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, since it is obviously closed, and it is contained in a ball with center the null matrix $O_{n\times n}$ and (total variation) radius 1. It follows that $f(Q)$ attains its minimum value for some $Q^* \in \mathscr{M}(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q})$.

Let $(X,Y) \sim Q^* = (q^*_{ij})$ where $Q^* \in \mathscr{M}(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q})$ is a minimizing matrix. Then, $X \sim \boldsymbol{p}$, $Y \sim \boldsymbol{q}$ and $f(Q^*) = \mathbb{P}[X = Y]$. A simple argument shows that the principal diagonal of any minimizing matrix Q^* can contain at most one nonzero entry. Indeed, if $q^*_{ii} > 0$ and $q^*_{jj} > 0$ with $i \neq j$, set $\gamma = \min\{q^*_{ii}, q^*_{jj}\} > 0$, and consider the matrix $\widetilde{Q} = (\widetilde{q}_{ij})$ which differs from Q^* only in the following four entries: $\widetilde{q}_{ii} = q^*_{ii} - \gamma$, $\widetilde{q}_{jj} = q^*_{jj} - \gamma$, $\widetilde{q}_{ij} = q^*_{ij} + \gamma$, $\widetilde{q}_{ji} = q^*_{ji} + \gamma$. Since the row/column sums are unaffected and the elements of $\widetilde{Q}$ are nonnegative, it is clear that $\widetilde{Q} \in \mathscr{M}(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q})$ and we arrived at the contradiction $f(\widetilde{Q}) = f(Q^*) - 2\gamma < f(Q^*)$. Therefore, all diagonal entries of a minimizing matrix Q^* have to be zero, with the possible exception of at most one of them.

Sufficiency: Assume that (3.6) is satisfied, and suppose that $\min_Q f(Q) = f(Q^*) = \theta > 0$. Let $q^*_{kk} = \theta$ and thus, $q^*_{ii} = 0$ for all $i \neq k$. Then,

$$\mathbb{P}[\{X = k\} \cup \{Y = k\}] = \mathbb{P}[X = k] + \mathbb{P}[Y = k] - \mathbb{P}[X = k, Y = k] = p_k + q_k - \theta.$$

Since $1 - p_k - q_k \geqslant 0$ (from (3.6)) we thus obtain

$$\mathbb{P}[X \neq k, Y \neq k] = 1 - \mathbb{P}[\{X = k\} \cup \{Y = k\}] = \theta + (1 - p_k - q_k) \geqslant \theta > 0.$$

On the other hand, since $q^*_{ii} = 0$ for all $i \neq k$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}[X \neq k, Y \neq k] = \sum_{(i,j):\ i\neq k, j\neq k, i\neq j} q^*_{ij}.$$

The above probability is at least θ, and thus, strictly positive. It follows that the sum contains at least one positive term. Hence, we can find two indices r,s with $r \neq k$, $s \neq k$, $r \neq s$, such that $q^*_{rs} > 0$. Set $\delta = \min\{\theta, q^*_{rs}\} > 0$ and consider the matrix $\widetilde{Q} = (\widetilde{q}_{ij})$ which differs from Q^* only in the elements $\widetilde{q}_{kk} = q^*_{kk} - \delta = \theta - \delta$, $\widetilde{q}_{rs} = q^*_{rs} - \delta$, $\widetilde{q}_{rk} = q^*_{rk} + \delta$, $\widetilde{q}_{ks} = q^*_{ks} + \delta$. Since the row/column sums are unaffected and the elements of $\widetilde{Q}$ are nonnegative, it is clear that $\widetilde{Q} \in \mathscr{M}(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q})$, and this results to the contradiction $f(\widetilde{Q}) = \theta - \delta < \theta$. Thus, $f(Q^*) = \mathbb{P}[X = Y] = 0$; this proves the existence of random vectors satisfying (3.5).

Necessity: This is entirely obvious. For, if a random vector (X,Y) satisfies (3.5) then $(X,Y) \sim Q$ for some $Q \in \mathscr{M}(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q})$ with $q_{ii} = 0$ for all i. Thus, for any i,

$$p_i + q_i = p_i + q_i - q_{ii} = \mathbb{P}[X = i] + \mathbb{P}[Y = i] - q_{ii} = \mathbb{P}[\{X = i\} \cup \{Y = i\}] \leqslant 1.$$

Uniqueness: Assume that $\max_i\{p_i+q_i\}=1$ and choose k with $p_k+q_k=1$. If $(X,Y)\sim Q$ satisfies (3.5), we have $\mathbb{P}[\{X=k\}\cup\{Y=k\}]=p_k+q_k-q_{kk}\geqslant p_k+q_k-\mathbb{P}[X=Y]=p_k+q_k=1$. It follows that Q can have non-zero entries only in its k-th row and in its k-th column. Thus, $q_{ik}=p_i$ for all $i\neq k$, $q_{kj}=q_j$ for all $j\neq k$ and $q_{ij}=0$ otherwise; hence, Q is uniquely determined from $\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q}$. Note that k need not be unique, but Q is always unique. For example, if $\boldsymbol{p}=(1-p,p,0,\dots,0)$ and $\boldsymbol{q}=(p,1-p,0,\dots,0)$ with $0\leqslant p\leqslant 1$, we obtain the unique solution to (3.5) as $\mathbb{P}[X=2,Y=1]=p=1-\mathbb{P}[X=1,Y=2]$. In fact, one can easily verify that this example describes the most general case (modulo the positions of $p,1-p$) where the relation $p_k+q_k=1$ can hold for more than one index k.

Non-uniqueness: Suppose that all p_i and q_i are positive and that (3.6) holds as a strict inequality, that is, $p_i+q_i<1$ for all i. [The last assumption is possible only if $n\geqslant 3$.] Set $\beta=\frac{1}{n^2}\big[1-\max_i\{p_i+q_i\}\big]>0$, $\delta=\min_{i,j}\{p_iq_j\}>0$ and $\varepsilon=\min\{\beta,\delta\}>0$. Define

$$\mathscr{M}_\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q}):=\big\{Q\in\mathscr{M}(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q}):q_{ij}\geqslant\varepsilon\text{ for all }i,j\text{ with }i\neq j\big\}.$$

Observe that $\mathscr{M}_\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q})$ is a nonempty (since it contains $Q=(p_iq_j)$) compact subject of $\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$. Applying the same arguments as in the beginning of the proof we see that the continuous function $f(Q)=\mathrm{trace}(Q)$ attains its minimum value at a matrix $Q_\varepsilon^*=(q_{ij}^*)\in\mathscr{M}_\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q})$; Q_ε^* has at most one nonzero diagonal entry while, by the definition of $\mathscr{M}_\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q})$, all off-diagonal entries are at least ε. Let $(X,Y)\sim Q_\varepsilon^*$. Assuming $\mathbb{P}[X=Y]=\theta>0$ we can find a unique index k such that $q_{kk}^*=\theta$; then, $\mathbb{P}[\{X=k\}\cup\{Y=k\}]=p_k+q_k-\theta$. Since $q_{ii}^*=0$ for $i\neq k$, we have

$$\sum_{(i,j):\ i\neq k,j\neq k,i\neq j}q_{ij}^*=\mathbb{P}[X\neq k,Y\neq k]=\theta+(1-p_k-q_k)\geqslant\theta+\big[1-\max_i\{p_i+q_i\}\big]$$
$$=\theta+n^2\beta\geqslant\theta+n^2\varepsilon>n^2\varepsilon.$$

This sum contains $(n-1)(n-2)<n^2$ terms and the inequality shows that at least one of them is greater than ε. Thus, we can find two indices r,s with $r\neq k$, $s\neq k$, $r\neq s$, such that $q_{rs}^*>\varepsilon$; say $q_{rs}^*=\varepsilon+\gamma$ with $\gamma>0$. Set $\lambda=\min\{\theta,\gamma\}>0$ and consider the matrix $\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon=(\widetilde{q}_{ij})$, which differs from Q_ε^* at exactly the four elements $\widetilde{q}_{kk}=q_{kk}^*-\lambda=\theta-\lambda\geqslant 0$, $\widetilde{q}_{rs}=q_{rs}^*-\lambda=\varepsilon+(\gamma-\lambda)\geqslant\varepsilon$, $\widetilde{q}_{rk}=q_{rk}^*+\lambda$, $\widetilde{q}_{ks}=q_{ks}^*+\lambda$. It is clear that $\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon\in\mathscr{M}_\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{q})$ and, once again, it contradicts the definition of Q_ε^*: $f(\widetilde{Q}_\varepsilon)=\theta-\lambda<\theta=f(Q_\varepsilon^*)$. Thus, $f(Q_\varepsilon^*)=\mathbb{P}[X=Y]=0$. This shows the existence of random vectors (X,Y) satisfying (3.5) with the additional property $\mathbb{P}[X=i,Y=j]\geqslant\varepsilon>0$ for all $i\neq j$, provided that $\varepsilon>0$ is sufficiently small. Given a probability matrix $Q_\varepsilon^*=(q_{ij}^*)$ of this form, it is easy to construct a second solution, $Q=(q_{ij})$, to (3.5); e.g., set $q_{12}=q_{12}^*-\varepsilon/2$, $q_{13}=q_{13}^*+\varepsilon/2$, $q_{21}=q_{21}^*+\varepsilon/2$, $q_{23}=q_{23}^*-\varepsilon/2$, $q_{31}=q_{31}^*-\varepsilon/2$, $q_{32}=q_{32}^*+\varepsilon/2$, and leave the rest entries unchanged. Finally, it is easy to see that if Q_0, Q_1 both solve (3.5), the same is true for $Q_t=tQ_1+(1-t)Q_0$, $0\leqslant t\leqslant 1$, and the proof is complete. □

Proof of Theorem 3.1: Assume that $\mathbb{E}R_n=AG_n$ for some random vector $\boldsymbol{X}$ with $\mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{X}=\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\mathrm{Var}\boldsymbol{X}=\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2$. Set $c=\overline{\mu}$, $\lambda=\frac{1}{4}AG_n>0$ and take expectations in (2.3) to get (cf. Remark 2.2)

$$AG_n=\mathbb{E}R_n\leqslant\tfrac{-(n-2)AG_n}{4}+\tfrac{AG_n}{8}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\mathbb{E}\Big\{\Big|\frac{X_i-\overline{\mu}}{AG_n/4}-1\Big|+\Big|\frac{X_i-\overline{\mu}}{AG_n/4}+1\Big|\Big\}.$$

Next, from $|y-1|+|y+1|\leqslant 2+\frac{1}{2}y^2$ with equality if and only if $y\in\{-2,0,2\}$ we get

$$\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\mathbb{E}\Big\{\Big|\frac{X_i-\overline{\mu}}{AG_n/4}-1\Big|+\Big|\frac{X_i-\overline{\mu}}{AG_n/4}+1\Big|\Big\}\leqslant 2n+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\mathbb{E}\Big\{\Big(\frac{X_i-\overline{\mu}}{AG_n/4}\Big)^2\Big\}=2n+4.$$

Since $\frac{-(n-2)AG_n}{4}+\frac{AG_n}{8}(2n+4)=AG_n$, it follows that the preceding inequalities are, in fact, equalities. Therefore, $\mathbb{E}R_n=AG_n$ is equivalent to (2.4) (with $c=\overline{\mu}$, $\lambda=\frac{1}{4}AG_n$) and $\frac{X_i-\overline{\mu}}{AG_n/4}\in\{-2,0,2\}$, $i=1,\dots,n$

(of course, it suffices to hold with probability 1). Hence, $\mathbb{E}R_n = AG_n$ if and only if

$$\text{and} \quad \begin{array}{ll} \text{(a)} & X_{1:n} \leqslant \overline{\mu} - \frac{1}{4}AG_n \leqslant X_{2:n} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant X_{n-1:n} \leqslant \overline{\mu} + \frac{1}{4}AG_n \leqslant X_{n:n} \\ \text{(b)} & X_i \in \left\{\overline{\mu} - \frac{AG_n}{2}, \overline{\mu}, \overline{\mu} + \frac{AG_n}{2}\right\}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n, \end{array} \tag{A.1}$$

with probability 1. Therefore, the (essential) support of any extremal random vector is a subset of

$$S := \left\{\left(\overline{\mu}, \ldots, \overline{\mu}, \overline{\mu} + \tfrac{AG_n}{2}, \overline{\mu}, \ldots, \overline{\mu}, \overline{\mu} - \tfrac{AG_n}{2}, \overline{\mu}, \ldots, \overline{\mu}\right)\right\},$$

where the plus and minus signs can appear at any two (different) places. Clearly, S has $n(n-1)$ elements and can be written as

$$S = \left\{\overline{\mu}\,\mathbf{1} + \tfrac{\boldsymbol{e}(i) - \boldsymbol{e}(j)}{2} AG_n : (i,j) \in \{1, \ldots, n\}^2, i \neq j\right\}.$$

Let $S' := \left\{(i,j) \in \{1, \ldots, n\}^2 : i \neq j\right\}$. The function $g : S' \to S$, that sends (i,j) to $g(i,j) = \overline{\mu}\,\mathbf{1} + \frac{\boldsymbol{e}(i) - \boldsymbol{e}(j)}{2} AG_n$, is a bijection. It follows that $(X,Y) := g^{-1}(\boldsymbol{X})$ is a random pair with values in a subset of S', and $\boldsymbol{X} = g(X,Y)$; this verifies the representation (3.2). For $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ we set

$$p_i^+ := \mathbb{P}[X_i = \overline{\mu} + \tfrac{AG_n}{2}] = \mathbb{P}[X = i], \quad p_i^- = \mathbb{P}[X_i = \overline{\mu} - \tfrac{AG_n}{2}] = \mathbb{P}[Y = i],$$

so that $\mathbb{P}[X_i = \overline{\mu}] = 1 - p_i^+ - p_i^-$. From $\mathbb{E}X_i = \mu_i$ we get $p_i^+ - p_i^- = \frac{2(\mu_i - \overline{\mu})}{AG_n}$ and from $\mathbb{E}\left\{(X_i - \overline{\mu})^2\right\} = (\mu_i - \overline{\mu})^2 + \sigma_i^2$ we obtain $p_i^+ + p_i^- = \frac{4[(\mu_i - \overline{\mu})^2 + \sigma_i^2]}{AG_n^2}$. Hence,

$$p_i^+ = \frac{2[(\mu_i - \overline{\mu})^2 + \sigma_i^2] + (\mu_i - \overline{\mu})AG_n}{AG_n^2}, \quad p_i^- = \frac{2[(\mu_i - \overline{\mu})^2 + \sigma_i^2] - (\mu_i - \overline{\mu})AG_n}{AG_n^2},$$

and (3.3) follows. Therefore, we can find a random vector $\boldsymbol{X}$ with $\mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{X} = \boldsymbol{\mu}$, $\mathrm{Var}\,\boldsymbol{X} = \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2$ and $\mathbb{E}R_n = AG_n$ if and only if the above construction of a random pair (X,Y), with $\mathbb{P}[X = Y] = 0$, is possible. According to Lemma 3.1, this is equivalent to $\max_i \left\{p_i^+ + p_i^-\right\} \leqslant 1$, which gives (3.1)(ii) (it also guarantees that $\mathbb{P}[X_i = \overline{\mu}] = 1 - p_i^+ - p_i^- \geqslant 0$), while (3.1)(i) follows from $p_i^+ \geqslant 0$ and $p_i^- \geqslant 0$.

Finally, the inequalities (3.1) are strict for all i if and only if $p_i^+ + p_i^- < 1$, $p_i^+ > 0$ and $p_i^- > 0$ for all i. Lemma 3.1 shows that there exist infinitely many vectors (X,Y) in this case. Also, if (3.1) is satisfied and we have equality in (3.1)(ii) for some i, uniqueness follows again from Lemma 3.1. □

Proof of Lemma 4.1: The functions $f_i : T \to (0,\infty)$ $(i = 1,2,3,4)$ given by $f_1(x,y) := 2\sqrt{x^2+y^2}$, $f_2(x,y) := 2 + \frac{1}{2}(x^2+y^2)$, $f_3(x,y) := x + 1 + \sqrt{(x-1)^2+y^2}$ and $f_4(x,y) := 1 - x + \sqrt{(x+1)^2+y^2}$ are obviously $C^\infty(T)$. The function U can be defined as the restriction of f_1 in $A_1 := \{(x,y) \in T : x^2+y^2 \geqslant 4\}$, of f_2 in $A_2 := \{(x,y) \in T : 2|x| \leqslant x^2+y^2 \leqslant 4\}$, of f_3 in $A_3 := \{(x,y) \in T : x^2+y^2 \leqslant 2x\}$ and of f_4 in $A_4 := \{(x,y) \in T : x^2+y^2 \leqslant -2x\}$. Observe that A_3 and A_4 are the closed (with respect to T) semidisks $T \cap D((1,0),1)$, $T \cap D((-1,0),1)$; also, $A_2 = T \cap [D((0,0),2) \setminus A_3^o \cup A_4^o]$, and $A_1 = T \setminus A_2^o \cup A_3 \cup A_4$. Therefore, $A_1 \cap A_3 = \emptyset$, $A_1 \cap A_4 = \emptyset$, $A_3 \cap A_4 = \emptyset$, $\partial A_1 = A_1 \cap A_2 = \{(x,y) \in T : x^2+y^2 = 4\}$, $\partial A_3 = A_2 \cap A_3 = \{(x,y) \in T : (x-1)^2+y^2 = 1\}$, $\partial A_4 = A_2 \cap A_4 = \{(x,y) \in T : (x+1)^2+y^2 = 1\}$ and $\partial A_2 = \partial A_1 \cup \partial A_3 \cup \partial A_4$. It is easy to check that both partial derivatives of f_1 and f_2 coincide at ∂A_1, that both partial derivatives of f_2 and f_3 coincide at ∂A_3 and that both partial derivatives of f_2 and f_4 coincide at ∂A_4. We conclude that for $(x,y) \in T$,

$$U_1(x,y) := \frac{\partial}{\partial x} U(x,y) = \begin{cases} \frac{x}{\sqrt{x^2+y^2}}, & \text{if} \quad x^2+y^2 \geqslant 4, \\ x, & \text{if} \quad 2|x| \leqslant x^2+y^2 \leqslant 4, \\ \frac{x-1}{\sqrt{(x-1)^2+y^2}} + 1, & \text{if} \quad (x-1)^2+y^2 \leqslant 1, \\ \frac{x+1}{\sqrt{(x+1)^2+y^2}} - 1, & \text{if} \quad (x+1)^2+y^2 \leqslant 1, \end{cases} \tag{A.2}$$

and

$$U_2(x,y) := \frac{\partial}{\partial y}U(x,y) = \begin{cases} \frac{y}{\sqrt{x^2+y^2}}, & \text{if} \quad x^2+y^2 \geqslant 4, \\ y, & \text{if} \quad 2|x| \leqslant x^2+y^2 \leqslant 4, \\ \frac{y}{\sqrt{(x-1)^2+y^2}}, & \text{if} \quad (x-1)^2+y^2 \leqslant 1, \\ \frac{y}{\sqrt{(x+1)^2+y^2}}, & \text{if} \quad (x+1)^2+y^2 \leqslant 1, \end{cases} \tag{A.3}$$

and the above functions are obviously continuous. □

Proof of Proposition 4.1: Fix $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{y}$ in T. The set ∂A_2 (where U changes type) is a union of three disjoint semicircles, and the line segment $[\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}] = \{\boldsymbol{x}+t(\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{x}),\, 0 \leqslant t \leqslant 1\}$ can have at most six common points with $\partial A_2 = \{(x,y) \in T : x^2+y^2 = 4 \text{ or } (x-1)^2+y^2 = 1 \text{ or } (x+1)^2+y^2 = 1\}$; for the definition of A_2 see the proof of Lemma 4.1. Consider now the function $g : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ with $g(t) := U(\boldsymbol{x}+t(\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{x}))$, $0 \leqslant t \leqslant 1$, which is continuously differentiable from Lemma 4.1. Also, g is of the form (4.2) with $k \in \{0,\ldots,6\}$, where $g_i(t) = f_j(\boldsymbol{x}+t(\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{x}))$, $0 \leqslant t \leqslant 1$, for some $j = j(i) \in \{1,2,3,4\}$ (the functions $f_j : T \to (0,\infty)$ are defined in the proof of Lemma 4.1). It is easy to verify that each f_j has nonnegative definite Hessian matrix and, thus, is convex. Lemma 4.2 asserts that $g_i(t) : [0,1] \to (0,\infty)$ $(i = 1,\ldots,k+1)$ is convex. Since g is continuously differentiable, (4.1) is automatically satisfied, and we conclude from Lemma 4.3 that g is convex. Therefore, g is convex for any choice of $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{y}$ in T, and a final application of Lemma 4.2 completes the proof. □

Proof of Lemma 4.4: (i) Fix $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $y_0 > 0$ and let $\alpha \in (0,1)$, $c_1,c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lambda_1,\lambda_2 > 0$. Write $\beta_1 = \frac{\alpha\lambda_1}{\alpha\lambda_1+(1-\alpha)\lambda_2} > 0$, $\beta_2 = \frac{(1-\alpha)\lambda_2}{\alpha\lambda_1+(1-\alpha)\lambda_2} > 0$, so that $\beta_1+\beta_2 = 1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{h\big(\alpha c_1+(1-\alpha)c_2, \alpha\lambda_1+(1-\alpha)\lambda_2\big)}{\alpha\lambda_1+(1-\alpha)\lambda_2} &= f\big(\tfrac{x_0-[\alpha c_1+(1-\alpha)c_2]}{\alpha\lambda_1+(1-\alpha)\lambda_2}, \tfrac{y_0}{\alpha\lambda_1+(1-\alpha)\lambda_2}\big) \\ &= f\big(\beta_1\big(\tfrac{x_0-c_1}{\lambda_1}\big)+\beta_2\big(\tfrac{x_0-c_2}{\lambda_2}\big), \beta_1\big(\tfrac{y_0}{\lambda_1}\big)+\beta_2\big(\tfrac{y_0}{\lambda_2}\big)\big) \\ &\leqslant \beta_1 f\big(\tfrac{x_0-c_1}{\lambda_1}, \tfrac{y_0}{\lambda_1}\big)+\beta_2 f\big(\tfrac{x_0-c_2}{\lambda_2}, \tfrac{y_0}{\lambda_2}\big) = \frac{\alpha h(c_1,\lambda_1)+(1-\alpha)h(c_2,\lambda_2)}{\alpha\lambda_1+(1-\alpha)\lambda_2}, \end{aligned}$$

showing that h is convex.

(ii) Suppose that for a particular $(x_0,y_0) \in T$, the function $h_0(c,\lambda) = \lambda f\big(\frac{x_0-c}{\lambda}, \frac{y_0}{\lambda}\big)$ is convex. Set $x = \frac{x_0-c}{\lambda}$, $y = \frac{y_0}{\lambda} > 0$, so that

$$c = x_0 - y_0\frac{x}{y}, \quad \lambda = \frac{y_0}{y}, \quad y_0 f(x,y) = y h_0\Big(x - y_0\frac{x}{y}, \frac{y_0}{y}\Big), \ (x,y) \in T.$$

Let $\alpha \in (0,1)$, $x_1,x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $y_1,y_2 > 0$. Let us now write $\beta_1 = \frac{\alpha y_1}{\alpha y_1+(1-\alpha)y_2} > 0$, $\beta_2 = \frac{(1-\alpha)y_2}{\alpha y_1+(1-\alpha)y_2} > 0$, so that $\beta_1+\beta_2 = 1$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & y_0 f\big(\alpha x_1+(1-\alpha)x_2, \alpha y_1+(1-\alpha)y_2\big) \\ &\quad = \big[\alpha y_1+(1-\alpha)y_2\big]\, h_0\Big(\beta_1\Big(x_1 - y_0\frac{x_1}{y_1}\Big)+\beta_2\Big(x_2 - y_0\frac{x_2}{y_2}\Big), \beta_1\Big(\frac{y_0}{y_1}\Big)+\beta_2\Big(\frac{y_0}{y_2}\Big)\Big) \\ &\quad \leqslant \big[\alpha y_1+(1-\alpha)y_2\big]\Big\{\beta_1 h_0\Big(x_1 - y_0\frac{x_1}{y_1}, \frac{y_0}{y_1}\Big)+\beta_2 h_0\Big(x_2 - y_0\frac{x_2}{y_2}, \frac{y_0}{y_2}\Big)\Big\} \\ &\quad = \alpha y_1 h_0\Big(x_1 - y_0\frac{x_1}{y_1}, \frac{y_0}{y_1}\Big)+(1-\alpha)y_2 h_0\Big(x_2 - y_0\frac{x_2}{y_2}, \frac{y_0}{y_2}\Big) \\ &\quad = y_0\big[\alpha f(x_1,y_1)+(1-\alpha)f(x_2,y_2)\big], \end{aligned}$$

and the proof is complete. □

Proof of Lemma 5.2: If $(c_0,\lambda_0)\in T_0$ then, by Proposition 5.1, $\phi_n(c,\lambda)\geqslant\phi_n(c_0,\lambda_0)$ for all $(c,\lambda)\in T$. On the other hand, for this c_0 we can define the function $\psi_n(\lambda)=\phi_n(c_0,\lambda)$; by Lemma 5.1, the function $\psi_n(\lambda)$ is minimized at a unique $\lambda=\lambda_1=\lambda_1(c_0)$. Thus,

$$\psi_n(\lambda_0)=\phi_n(c_0,\lambda_0)\leqslant\phi_n(c_0,\lambda_1)=\psi_n(\lambda_1)\leqslant\psi_n(\lambda_0);$$

the first inequality follows from $(c_0,\lambda_0)\in T_0$ and the second from the definition of λ_1. Therefore, $\psi_n(\lambda_0)=\psi_n(\lambda_1)$, so that $\lambda=\lambda_0$ is a minimizing point for $\psi_n(\lambda)$. By uniqueness, $\lambda_1=\lambda_0$. Thus, $\lambda_0=\lambda_1(c_0)$, where $\lambda_1(\cdot):\mathbb{R}\to(0,\infty)$ is a well-defined function; it is described (implicitly) in Lemma 5.1. Hence, if $(c_0,\lambda_0)\neq(c_2,\lambda_2)$ are any two points in T_0 then $c_0\neq c_2$; indeed, $c_0=c_2$ implies $\lambda_0=\lambda_1(c_0)=\lambda_1(c_2)=\lambda_2$, contradicting the assumption $(c_0,\lambda_0)\neq(c_2,\lambda_2)$.

Let L be the straight line that passes through the points (c_0,λ_0) and (c_2,λ_2). We now verify that if $(c_3,\lambda_3)\in T_0$ then $(c_3,\lambda_3)\in L$. Indeed, if $(c_3,\lambda_3)\in T_0\setminus L$ then the convex hull B of the triangle $\{(c_0,\lambda_0),(c_2,\lambda_2),(c_3,\lambda_3)\}$ must be a subject of T_0, because T_0 is convex. Since, however, $(c_3,\lambda_3)\notin L$, the set B contains a line segment of positive length, parallel to the λ-axis and, by the previous argument, this is impossible. It follows that $T_0\subseteq L\cap T$, and since T_0 is compact and convex, it must be a compact line segment. □

Proof of Lemma 5.3: By assumption, A is moving linearly in the line segment $[A_0,A_1]$ from A_0 to A_1, thus we may write $A=A(t):=(c(t),\lambda(t))$ where $c(t)=c_0+t(c_1-c_0)$, $\lambda(t)=\lambda_0+t(\lambda_1-\lambda_0)$, $0\leqslant t\leqslant 1$. Then $B=B(t)=\left(\frac{\mu-c(t)}{\lambda(t)},\frac{\sigma}{\lambda(t)}\right)$, so that $B(0)=B_0$, $B(1)=B_1$ and $B(t)$ is continuous in t. It follows that for all $t\in[0,1]$,

$$\det[B_0,B(t),B_1]:=\begin{vmatrix}\frac{\mu-c_0}{\lambda_0}&\frac{\sigma}{\lambda_0}&1\\ \frac{\mu-c(t)}{\lambda(t)}&\frac{\sigma}{\lambda(t)}&1\\ \frac{\mu-c_1}{\lambda_1}&\frac{\sigma}{\lambda_1}&1\end{vmatrix}=\frac{\sigma}{\lambda_0\lambda(t)\lambda_1}\begin{vmatrix}c_0&\lambda_0&1\\ c(t)&\lambda(t)&1\\ c_1&\lambda_1&1\end{vmatrix}=0.\ \square$$

Proof of Theorem 5.1: According to Proposition 5.1, it remains to verify that T_0 in (5.2) is a singleton. Assume, in contrary, that T_0 contains two points $(c_0,\lambda_0)\neq(c_1,\lambda_1)$. From Lemma 5.2 we know that $c_0\neq c_1$, and that all points $(c,\lambda)\in T_0$ can be written as $(c,\lambda)=(c,\alpha c+\beta)$, $c_2\leqslant c\leqslant c_3$, for some $\alpha,\beta,c_2,c_3\in\mathbb{R}$ with $c_2<c_3$. Therefore, we can write $\lambda(c)=\alpha c+\beta$, $c_2\leqslant c\leqslant c_3$, and

$$T_0=\{(c,\alpha c+\beta),\ c_2\leqslant c\leqslant c_3\},\ \ \alpha,\beta,c_2,c_3\in\mathbb{R},\ c_2<c_3.$$

Note that the parameters α, β, c_2, c_3 have to fulfill additional restrictions so that $\lambda(c)>0$ for all $c\in[c_2,c_3]$; namely, $\alpha c_2+\beta>0$ and $\alpha c_3+\beta>0$.

Consider now the points $A(c):=(c,\lambda(c))$ and $B_i(c):=\left(\frac{\mu_i-c}{\lambda(c)},\frac{\sigma_i}{\lambda(c)}\right)$, $i=1,\dots,n$, $c_2\leqslant c\leqslant c_3$. As c varies in $[c_2,c_3]$, the point $A=A(c)$ is moved from $A(c_2)$ to $A(c_3)$, generating the line segment $[A(c_2),A(c_3)]=T_0\subset T$. It follows from Lemma 5.3 that each point $B_i=B_i(c)$, $i=1,\dots,n$, produces a line segment too; that is, B_i generates its corresponding segment $L_i:=[B_i(c_2),B_i(c_3)]\subset T$. Consider now the region $A_2=\{(x,y)\in T:2|x|\leqslant x^2+y^2\leqslant 4\}\subset T$. The function $U(x,y)$ (see (2.6)) changes types (and it is not even C^2) only at the boundary points of A_2, i.e., at those $(x,y)\in T$ that belong to the set

$$C:=\{x^2+y^2=4\}\cup\{(x-1)^2+y^2=1\}\cup\{(x+1)^2+y^2=1\}\subset\mathbb{R}^2.$$

The set $\partial A_2=C\cap T$ is a union of three (disjoint) semicircles, and thus, any line segment can have at most six common points with it. It follows that only of finite number of points of the set $\cup_{i=1}^n L_i=\cup_{i=1}^n\cup_{c_2\leqslant c\leqslant c_3}B_i(c)$ can intersect ∂A_2. Let $\Gamma_1,\dots,\Gamma_k$ be all these points. Each Γ_j belongs to some L_i; that is, for any $j\in\{1,\dots,k\}$ we can find an index $i=i(j)\in\{1,\dots,n\}$, and then a unique number

$t = t_{ij} \in [c_2, c_3]$ such that $B_i(t) = \Gamma_j$. Clearly, for a particular index j, the maximal number of different t's that can be found (satisfying $B_i(t) = \Gamma_j$ for some i) is n, because $B_i(t_1) \neq B_i(t_2)$ if $t_1 \neq t_2$. Therefore, the set

$$N := \{t \in [c_2, c_3] : B_i(t) = \Gamma_j \text{ for some } i \text{ and } j\}$$

is finite, say $N = \{t_1, \ldots, t_m\}$ with $c_2 \leqslant t_1 < \cdots < t_m \leqslant c_3$. Fix now an interval $[t,s] \subseteq (c_2, c_3)$, of positive length, such that $[t,s] \cap N = \emptyset$. Since $[t,s]$ has no common points with N, it is clear that the line segment $J_i := [B_i(t), B_i(s)] \subseteq L_i$ does not intersect ∂A_2, and this is true for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. In this way we obtain a subset T_1 of T_0, namely

$$T_1 := \{(c, \alpha c + \beta),\ t \leqslant c \leqslant s\}, \quad \text{with } c_2 < t < s < c_3.$$

The boundary of A_2 divides T into four disjoint open regions, namely

$$\begin{array}{ll} G_1 := \{(x,y) \in T : x^2 + y^2 > 4\}, & G_2 := \{(x,y) \in T : 2|x| < x^2 + y^2 < 4\}, \\ G_3 := \{(x,y) \in T : (x-1)^2 + y^2 < 1\}, & G_4 := \{(x,y) \in T : (x+1)^2 + y^2 < 1\}. \end{array}$$

Compared to T_0, the set T_1 has the additional property that, as c varies, every line segment $\{B_i(c), t \leqslant c \leqslant s\}$ stays in the same open region. This means that the sets of indices I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4, defined in Remark 5.1, do not depend on c. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} &B_i(c) \in G_1 \Leftrightarrow (\mu_i - c)^2 + \sigma_i^2 > 4\lambda^2 \Rightarrow i \in I_1, \\ &B_i(c) \in G_2 \Leftrightarrow 2\lambda|\mu_i - c| < (\mu_i - c)^2 + \sigma_i^2 < 4\lambda^2 \Rightarrow i \in I_2, \\ &B_i(c) \in G_3 \Leftrightarrow (\mu_i - c)^2 + \sigma_i^2 < 2\lambda(\mu_i - c) \Rightarrow i \in I_3, \\ &B_i(c) \in G_4 \Leftrightarrow (\mu_i - c)^2 + \sigma_i^2 < -2\lambda(\mu_i - c) \Rightarrow i \in I_4, \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda = \lambda(c) = \alpha c + \beta$.

Consider now the function $g_n : (t,s) \to \mathbb{R}$ with

$$g_n(c) := \phi_n(c, \lambda(c)) = \phi_n(c, \alpha c + \beta),\ \ t < c < s.$$

The explicit form of g_n is quite complicated:

$$\begin{aligned} g_n(c) \ = \ & -(n-2)(\alpha c + \beta) + \textstyle\sum_{i \in I_1} \sqrt{(\mu_i - c)^2 + \sigma_i^2} \\ & + \textstyle\sum_{i \in I_2} \left\{ (\alpha c + \beta) + \frac{1}{4(\alpha c + \beta)} \left[(\mu_i - c)^2 + \sigma_i^2 \right] \right\} \\ & + \textstyle\sum_{i \in I_3} \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \mu_i - c + (\alpha c + \beta) + \sqrt{\left[\mu_i - c - (\alpha c + \beta) \right]^2 + \sigma_i^2} \right\} \\ & + \textstyle\sum_{i \in I_4} \frac{1}{2} \left\{ c - \mu_i + (\alpha c + \beta) + \sqrt{\left[c - \mu_i - (\alpha c + \beta) \right]^2 + \sigma_i^2} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since, however, the sets I_j do not depend on c, it is obvious that $g_n \in C^\infty(t,s)$. By assumption, $(c, \lambda(c))$ minimizes $\phi_n(c, \lambda)$ for all $c \in (t,s)$, and this means that $g_n(c)$ is constant, implying that $g_n''(c) = 0$, $t < c < s$. A straightforward computation shows that for all $c \in (t,s)$,

$$\begin{aligned} g_n''(c) \ = \ & \textstyle\sum_{i \in I_1} \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\left[(\mu_i - c)^2 + \sigma_i^2 \right]^{3/2}} + \frac{1}{2[\lambda(c)]^3} \sum_{i \in I_2} \left\{ \alpha^2 \sigma_i^2 + (\alpha \mu_i + \beta)^2 \right\} \\ & + \frac{(\alpha+1)^2}{2} \textstyle\sum_{i \in I_3} \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\left[(\beta + (\alpha+1)c - \mu_i)^2 + \sigma_i^2 \right]^{3/2}} + \frac{(\alpha-1)^2}{2} \sum_{i \in I_4} \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\left[(\beta + (\alpha-1)c + \mu_i)^2 + \sigma_i^2 \right]^{3/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, all summands are nonnegative. If $\alpha \neq 0$, the only two possibilities which are compatible with $g_n''(c) = 0$ are the following: (i) either $I_1 = I_2 = I_4 = \emptyset$ (and thus, $N(I_3) = n$) and $\alpha = -1$ or

(ii) $I_1 = I_2 = I_3 = \emptyset$ (and $N(I_4) = n$) and $\alpha = 1$. However, because of (5.8), neither (i) nor (ii) is allowed for a minimizing point (c, λ), and in particular for $(c, \lambda(c))$. Finally, if $\alpha = 0$ then we must have $I_1 = I_3 = I_4 = \emptyset$ and, therefore, $N(I_2) = n$. The condition $\lambda(c) > 0$ now yields $\beta > 0$; thus, $g_n''(c) = \frac{n}{2\beta} > 0$ and $g_n(c)$ could not be a constant function in the interval $t < c < s$.

The resulting contradiction implies that the set T_0 cannot contain two distinct elements, and the proof is complete. □

Proof of Lemma 6.1: From (2.9), (A.2), (A.3), and in view of (6.3), (6.4),

$$\begin{aligned}\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\lambda}\phi_n(c,\lambda) &= -(n-2) + \tfrac{1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{i\in I_2}\left\{2 - \frac{1}{2\lambda^2}\left[(\mu_i - c)^2 + \sigma_i^2\right]\right\} \\ &\quad + \tfrac{1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{i\in I_3}\left\{1 - \frac{\mu_i - c - \lambda}{\sqrt{(\mu_i - c - \lambda)^2 + \sigma_i^2}}\right\} + \tfrac{1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{i\in I_4}\left\{1 - \frac{c - \mu_i - \lambda}{\sqrt{(c - \mu_i - \lambda)^2 + \sigma_i^2}}\right\} \\ &= -(n-2) + \sum_{i\in I_2\cup I_3\cup I_4} p_i^o.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda}\phi_n(c,\lambda) = 0$ and $p_i^o = 0$ for $i \in I_1$, it follows that $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i^o = n-2$. Taking into account the fact that $p_i^o = 1 - p_i^+ - p_i^-$, we obtain $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i^- + \sum_{i=1}^n p_i^+ = 2$.

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tfrac{\partial}{\partial c}\phi_n(c,\lambda) &= -\textstyle\sum_{i\in I_1}\frac{\mu_i - c}{\sqrt{(\mu_i - c)^2 + \sigma_i^2}} - \sum_{i\in I_2}\frac{\mu_i - c}{2\lambda} \\ &\quad - \textstyle\sum_{i\in I_3}\frac{1}{2}\left\{1 + \frac{\mu_i - c - \lambda}{\sqrt{(\mu_i - c - \lambda)^2 + \sigma_i^2}}\right\} + \sum_{i\in I_4}\frac{1}{2}\left\{1 + \frac{c - \mu_i - \lambda}{\sqrt{(c - \mu_i - \lambda)^2 + \sigma_i^2}}\right\} \\ &= -\sum_{i\in I_1}(p_i^+ - p_i^-) - \sum_{i\in I_2}(p_i^+ - p_i^-) - \sum_{i\in I_3} p_i^+ + \sum_{i\in I_4} p_i^-,\end{aligned}$$

that is, $\frac{\partial}{\partial c}\phi_n(c,\lambda) = -\sum_{i\in I_1\cup I_2\cup I_3} p_i^+ + \sum_{i\in I_1\cup I_2\cup I_4} p_i^-$. From the fact that $p_i^+ = 0$ for $i \in I_4$ and $p_i^- = 0$ for $i \in I_3$ (see (6.4)), the relation $\frac{\partial}{\partial c}\phi_n(c,\lambda) = 0$ implies the equality $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i^+ = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i^-$, and (6.7) follows. □

Proof of Proposition 6.1: [(ii) ⇒ (i)]. Suppose we are given a probability matrix Q satisfying (ii). By assumption, Q has vanishing principal diagonal. Define $\boldsymbol{X} = (X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ as in (6.9). Since $\sum_{(i,j):\, i\neq j} q_{ij} = \sum_{i,j} q_{ij} = 1$, this procedure maps Q to a well-defined probability law $\mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{X})$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and the map $Q \mapsto \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{X})$ is, obviously, one to one. Due to (6.6), the order statistics of $\boldsymbol{X}$ satisfy

$$X_{1:n} < c - \lambda < X_{2:n} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant X_{n-1:n} < c + \lambda < X_{n:n} \quad \text{with probability 1.} \tag{A.4}$$

Thus, from Lemma 2.1 it follows that, with probability 1,

$$R_n = -(n-2)\lambda + \tfrac{1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\left\{\left|(X_i - c) - \lambda\right| + \left|(X_i - c) + \lambda\right|\right\}. \tag{A.5}$$

The assumptions $Q \in \mathscr{M}(\boldsymbol{p}^+, \boldsymbol{p}^-)$ and $q_{ii} = 0$ for all i now show that for any fixed j, $\mathbb{P}[X_j = x_j^-] = \sum_{i\neq j} q_{ij} = \sum_{i=1}^n q_{ij} = p_j^-$. Similarly we conclude that for any fixed i, $\mathbb{P}[X_i = x_i^+] = \sum_{j\neq i} q_{ij} = \sum_{j=1}^n q_{ij} = p_i^+$. Thus, $\mathbb{P}[X_i = x_i^o] = 1 - p_i^- - p_i^+ = p_i^o$, and the marginal X_i of $\boldsymbol{X}$ is the extremal random variable in $\mathscr{F}_1(\mu_i, \sigma_i)$. That is, it has mean μ_i, variance σ_i^2, and maximizes $\mathbb{E}\{|(X - c) - \lambda| + |(X - c) - \lambda|\}$ as X varies in $\mathscr{F}_1(\mu_i, \sigma_i)$. Since this holds for all i, taking expectations in (A.5) we see that

$$\mathbb{E}R_n = -(n-2)\lambda + \tfrac{\lambda}{2}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n U\left(\frac{\mu_i - c}{\lambda}, \frac{\sigma_i}{\lambda}\right) = \rho_n, \tag{A.6}$$

completing the proof.

[(i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii)]. Assumptions $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathscr{F}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ and $\mathbb{E}R_n = \rho_n$ imply that (repeat the proof of Theorem 2.1)

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_n &= \mathbb{E}R_n \leqslant \mathbb{E}\big\{ -(n-2)\lambda + \tfrac{1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n \big[\big|(X_i-c)-\lambda\big| + \big|(X_i-c)+\lambda\big|\big]\big\} \\ &= -(n-2)\lambda + \tfrac{1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\big\{\big|(X_i-c)-\lambda\big| + \big|(X_i-c)+\lambda\big|\big\} \\ &\leqslant -(n-2)\lambda + \tfrac{\lambda}{2}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n U\big(\frac{\mu_i-c}{\lambda}, \frac{\sigma_i}{\lambda}\big) = \rho_n. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, all displayed inequalities are attained as equalities. In view of Lemma 2.1 and Corollary 2.1, this can happen only if the law $\mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{X})$ of the given random vector $\boldsymbol{X} = (X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{(a)} \quad \mathbb{P}\big[X_{1:n} \leqslant c-\lambda \leqslant X_{2:n} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant X_{n-1:n} \leqslant c+\lambda \leqslant X_{n:n}\big] = 1 \\ &\text{and} \\ &\text{(b)} \quad X_i \text{ is extremal in } \mathscr{F}_1(\mu_i, \sigma_i) \text{ for all } i, \text{ or, equivalently,} \\ &\qquad \mathbb{P}[X_i = x_i^-] = p_i^-,\ \mathbb{P}[X_i = x_i^o] = p_i^o,\ \mathbb{P}[X_i = x_i^+] = p_i^+,\ i = 1, \ldots, n. \end{aligned} \tag{A.7}$$

Taking into account (6.6) we conclude that (A.7) can happen only if the (essential) support of $\boldsymbol{X}$ is contained in the set

$$S := \big\{\boldsymbol{x}_{ij},\ i \neq j,\ i, j = 1, \ldots, n\big\}, \tag{A.8}$$

with $\boldsymbol{x}_{ij}$ as in (6.9). We can thus define the $n \times n$ matrix Q as follows:

$$Q := (q_{ij}), \text{ with } q_{ii} := 0,\ q_{ij} := \mathbb{P}[\boldsymbol{X} = \boldsymbol{x}_{ij}],\ i \neq j,\ i, j = 1, \ldots, n. \tag{A.9}$$

By definition, Q has vanishing principal diagonal and nonnegative entries, and the relation $\mathbb{P}[\boldsymbol{X} \in S] = 1$ implies that Q is a probability matrix. By the assumption $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathscr{F}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ and $\mathbb{E}R_n = \rho_n$, the marginal X_i of $\boldsymbol{X}$ has to fulfill (A.7)(b), that is, $\sum_{j=1}^n q_{ij} = \sum_{j \neq i} q_{ij} = \sum_j \mathbb{P}[\boldsymbol{X} = \boldsymbol{x}_{ij}] = \mathbb{P}[X_i = x_i^+] = p_i^+$; similarly, $\sum_{i=1}^n q_{ij} = p_j^-$. Therefore, we have constructed a matrix $Q \in \mathscr{M}(\boldsymbol{p}^+, \boldsymbol{p}^-)$ with $q_{ii} = 0$ for all i. Clearly, if two random vectors $\boldsymbol{X}$, $\boldsymbol{Y}$, with $\mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{Y}) \neq \mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{X})$, satisfy the assumptions in (i), the corresponding matrices (obtained through (A.9)) will be distinct. Consequently, the above procedure determines a one to one mapping $\mathscr{L}(\boldsymbol{X}) \mapsto Q$, completing the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 7.1: For the infimum, a proof (for any $n \geqslant 2$) is given in the beginning of Section 2, following the arguments of Bertsimas, Doan, Natarajan and Teo (2010). Regarding the supremum: The key-observation is that (7.4) is a special application of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}R_2 = \mathbb{E}|X_1 - X_2| \leqslant \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\big[(X_1-X_2)^2\big]} = \sqrt{(\mu_1-\mu_2)^2 + \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 - 2\rho\sigma_1\sigma_2} = \gamma_2.$$

This means that, in order to justify the equality, we have to construct a vector $(X_1, X_2) \in \mathscr{F}_2(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}; \rho)$ such that the random variable $|X_1 - X_2|$ is degenerate. Let $\delta := \mathrm{Var}[X_1 - X_2] = \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 - 2\rho\sigma_1\sigma_2 \geqslant 0$. We distinguish cases $\delta > 0$, $\delta = 0$.

Assume $\delta > 0$, so that $\gamma_2 > 0$. First, we consider a 0–1 Bernoulli random variable I_p with probability of success $p := \frac{1}{2}\big(1 + \frac{\mu_1-\mu_2}{\gamma_2}\big)$. Next, we consider another random variable T with mean $\mu_T := \mu_1\sigma_2^2 + \mu_2\sigma_1^2 - \rho\sigma_1\sigma_2(\mu_1+\mu_2)$ and variance $\sigma_T^2 := \delta\sigma_1^2\sigma_2^2(1-\rho^2) \geqslant 0$, stochastically independent of I_p. Finally, we define

$$(X_1, X_2) := \tfrac{1}{\delta}\ \big[\gamma_2(\sigma_1^2 - \rho\sigma_1\sigma_2)(2I_p - 1) + T,\ \gamma_2(\rho\sigma_1\sigma_2 - \sigma_2^2)(2I_p - 1) + T\big].$$

It is easily seen that $(X_1, X_2) \in \mathscr{F}_2(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}; \rho)$ and $|X_1 - X_2| = \gamma_2$ with probability 1.

Let us now assume $\delta = 0$. This implies that $X_1 - X_2 = \mu_1 - \mu_2$ with probability 1, and hence, $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$ and $\rho = 1$. Let $\sigma^2 > 0$ be the common variance and consider the pair $(X_1, X_2) := (\mu_1 + T, \mu_2 + T)$, where T is any random variable with mean zero and variance σ^2. It follows that (X_1, X_2) satisfies the moment requirements and $|X_1 - X_2| = |\mu_1 - \mu_2| = \gamma_2$ with probability 1. This completes the proof. □

References

[1] Arnold, B.C. (1980). Distribution-free bounds on the mean of the maximum of a dependent sample. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **38**, 163–167.

[2] Arnold, B.C. (1985). *p*-Norm bounds on the expectation of the maximum of possibly dependent sample. *J. Multivariate Anal.* **17**, 316–332.

[3] Arnold, B.C. (1988). Bounds on the expected maximum. *Commun. Statist.–Theory Meth.* **17**, 2135–2150.

[4] Arnold, B.C.; Balakrishnan, N. (1989). *Relations, Bounds and Approximations for Order Statistics*. Lecture Notes in Statistics, Vol. 53, Springer, New York.

[5] Arnold, B.C.; Groeneveld, R.A. (1979). Bounds on expectations of linear systematic statistics based on dependent samples. *Ann. Statist.* **7**, 220–223. Correction: **8**, 1401.

[6] Aven, T. (1985). Upper (lower) bounds on the mean of the maximum (minimum) of a number of random variables. *J. Appl. Probab.* **22**, 723–728.

[7] Balakrishnan, N.; Balasubramanian, K., (1993). Equivalence of Hartley-David-Gumbel and Papathanasiou bounds and some further remarks. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* **16**, 39–41.

[8] Barvinok, A. (2012). Matrices with prescribed row and column sums. *Linear Algebra Appl.* **436**, 820–844.

[9] Bertsimas, D.; Doan, X.V.; Natarajan, K.; Teo, C.-P. (2010). Models for minimax stochastic linear optimization problems with risk aversion. *Math. O. R.* **35**(3), 580–602.

[10] Bertsimas, D.; Natarajan, K.; Teo, C.-P. (2004). Probabilistic combinatorial optimization: moments, semidefinite programming and asymptotic bounds. *SIAM J. Optimiz.* **15**(1), 185–209.

[11] Bertsimas, D.; Natarajan, K.; Teo, C.-P. (2006). Tight bounds on expected order statistics. *Prob. Engineer. Inform. Sci.* **20**, 667–686.

[12] Caraux, G. and Gascuel, O. (1992). Bounds on distribution functions of order statistics for dependent variates. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* **14**, 103–105.

[13] David, H.A. (1981). *Order Statistics*, 2nd ed. Wiley, N.Y.

[14] David, H.A.; Nagaraja, H.N. (2003). *Order Statistics*, 3rd ed. Wiley, N.Y.

[15] Gajek, L.; Rychlik, T. (1996). Projection method for moment bounds on order statistics from restricted families. I. Dependent case. *J. Multivariate Anal.* **57**, 156–174.

[16] Gajek, L.; Rychlik, T. (1998). Projection method for moment bounds on order statistics from restricted families. II. Independent case. *J. Multivariate Anal.* **64**, 156–182.

[17] Gascuel, O.; Caraux, G. (1992). Bounds on expectations of order statistics via extremal dependencies. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* **15**, 143–148.

[18] Giaquinta, M.; Modica, G. (2012). *Mathematical Analysis. Foundations and Advanced Techniques for Functions of Several Variables*. Springer, Birkhäuser.

[19] Gumbel, E.J. (1954). The maxima of the mean largest value and of the range. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **25**, 76–84.

[20] Hartley, H.O.; David, H.A. (1954). Universal bounds for mean range and extreme observations. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **25**, 85–99.

[21] Isii, K. (1963). On the sharpness of Chebyshev-type inequalities *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* **14**, 185–197.

[22] Kaluszka, M.; Okolewski, A.; Szymanska, K. (2005). Sharp bounds for L-statistics from dependent samples of random length. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference* **127**, 71–89.

[23] Karlin, S.; Studden, W.J. (1966). *Tchebycheff Systems: With Applications in Analysis and Statistics*. Wiley-Interscience, N.Y.

[24] Lai, T.L.; Robbins, H. (1976). Maximally dependent random variables. *Proceedings of the National Academy of the Sciences of the United States of America* **73**(2), 286–288.

[25] Lefèvre, C. (1986). Bounds on the expectations of linear combinations of order statistics with applications to Pert networks. *Stochast. Anal. Appl.* **4**, 351–356.

[26] Meilijson, I.; Nadas, A. (1979). Convex majorization with an application to the length of critical path. *J. Appl. Probab.* **16**, 671–677.

[27] Nagaraja, H.N. (1981). Some finite sample results for the selection differential. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* **33**, 437–448.

[28] Natarajan, K.; Teo, C.-P. (2014). Semidefinite programming reformulation of completely positive programs: range estimation and best-worst choice modeling. Available at `http://people.sutd.edu.sg`.

[29] Navarro, J.; Balakrishnan, N. (2010). Study of some measures of dependence between order statistics and systems. *J. Multivariate Anal.* **101**, 52–67.

[30] Papadatos, N. (2001a). Expectation bounds on linear estimators from dependent samples. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference* **93**, 17–27.

[31] Papadatos, N. (2001b). Distribution and expectation bounds on order statistics from possibly dependent variates. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* **54**, 21–31.

[32] Papathanasiou, V. (1990). Some characterizations of distributions based on order statistics. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* **9**, 145–147.

[33] Placket, R.L. (1947). Limits of the ratio of mean range to standard deviation. *Biometrika* **34**, 120–122.

[34] Rychlik, T. (1992a). Sharp inequalities for linear combinations of elements of monotone sequences. *Bull. Polish Acad. Sci. Math.* **40**, 247–254.

[35] Rychlik, T. (1992b). Stochastically extremal distributions of order statistics for dependent samples. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* **13**, 337–341.

[36] Rychlik, T. (1993a). Bounds for expectations of L-estimates for dependent samples. *Statistics* **24**, 9–15.

[37] Rychlik, T. (1993b). Sharp bounds on L-estimates and their expectations for dependent samples. *Commun. Statist.–Theory & Meth.* **22**, 1053–1068. Erratum **23**, 305–306.

[38] Rychlik, T. (1994). Distributions and expectations of order statistics for possibly dependent random variables. *J. Multivariate Anal.* **48**, 31–42.

[39] Rychlik, T. (1995). Bounds for order statistics based on dependent variables with given nonidentical distributions. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* **23**, 351–358.

[40] Rychlik, T. (1998). Bounds on expectations of L-estimates. In: *Order Statistics: Theory and Methods* (N. Balakrishnan and C.R. Rao, eds.), Handbook of Statistics, vol. 16, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 105–145.

[41] Rychlik, T. (2001). *Projecting Statistical Functionals*. Lecture Notes in Statistics, **160**, Springer-Verlag, N.Y.

[42] Rychlik, T. (2007). Optimal deterministic bounds on L-statistics. In: *Recent Developments in Ordered Random Variables* (M. Ahsanullah and M.Z. Raqab, Eds.), Nova Science Publishers, N.Y., pp. 1–18.